

Upaniṣads Retoto

V. H. DATE

Īśāvāsyopaniṣad

Kenopaniṣad

Kāthopaniṣad

Muṇḍakopaniṣad

Praśnopaniṣad

Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad



In this book, the author has provided a free rendering of Upaniṣads in a simple and forceful style. He has presented their main ideas, of which he displays a firm grasp, in an intelligent and easily assimilable manner. This is not a mere translation, but as author has explained and commented on them, are also providing an interpretation of their philosophy.

Rs 350

Upaniṣads Retold

In this book, the author has provided a free rendering of Upaniṣads in a simple and forceful style. He has presented their main ideas, of which he displays a firm grasp, in an intelligent and easily assimilable manner. This is not a mere translation, but as author has explained and commented on them, are also providing an interpretation of their philosophy.

Dr. V.H. Date (1900-1987) was Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy, Rajasthan University and Founder-Director of Adhyatma Sahitya Vikas Sanstha, Jodhpur. He has published several books and articles.

****स्कैन्ड / Scanned****

Upanishads Retold

In this book, the author has provided a free rendering of 11 Upanishads in a simple and forceful style. He has presented their main ideas in a way that is easy to understand. He has also provided a brief introduction to each Upanishad. The book is a valuable addition to the literature of Indian philosophy. It is also a good introduction to the Upanishads for those who are new to the subject.

Dr. V. J. Datta (1900-1987) was Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy, Rajawade Sanshodhan Mandal, Dhule. He has published several books and articles on Indian philosophy and history.

Upaniṣads Retold

Vol. I

Īśāvāsyopaniṣad, Kenopaniṣad, Kaṭhopaniṣad,
Muṇḍakopaniṣad, Praśnopaniṣad, and
Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad

V.H. Date

cat-1114
18/11/2011

••स्कैन्ड/Scanned••



Munshiram Manoharlal
Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

To
My Spiritual Teacher
Dr. R.D. Ranade

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
<i>Introduction</i>	xi
1.	
Īśāvāsyopaniṣad	1
2.	
Kenopaniṣad	27
3.	
Kāthopaniṣad	56
4.	
Muṇḍakopaniṣad	81
5.	
Praśnopaniṣad	99
6	
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad	122
<i>Index</i>	393

57982

Contents

22	Index
23	Introduction
1	1. General
27	2. General
28	3. General
31	4. General
40	5. General
123	6. General
202	Index

Preface

It gives me great pleasure to be able to mention that with the publication of this book, I have been able to fulfil the desire of my Spiritual Teacher, the late Prof. R.D. Ranade, who wrote in his Foreword to my book *Vedānta Explained*, that I "should sometime undertake to expound the text of the Upaniṣads *seriatim* so that (my) exposition will also be found eminently readable as it will introduce readers to the contents of the Upaniṣads at first-hand, in the same clear manner." And as I had done the translation of Śāṅkara Bhāṣya of the *Brahma Sūtras*, Prof. Ranade had further expressed the hope that my "translation will enable some at least to rise on the ladder of Vedānta Philosophy to its real spirit, namely, the first-hand contact with reality, which is the beginning, the end, and the life of the world—Tajjalan."

The Upaniṣads are a compendium of various trends of philosophical ideas of the ancient seers of India. They are a blend of speculative approach and revealed insight. As such, their philosophical thought as a whole, regarding the ultimate metaphysical questions, regarding Mind, Matter and God, cannot be said to be an anti-rationalistic, anti-emotional, or anti-volitional; but, at the same time, it should not be forgotten that the Upaniṣads have a further dimension: they are spiritual in nature. Therefore, ideas about God and the Absolute are not merely logical concepts, but matters of faith and direct and immediate experience, as the late Professor R.D. Ranade used to say.

Naturally the next question is as to how we should have this direct vision of the God-head. The Upaniṣadic seers have answered by saying that moral perfection and spiritual discipline must go hand in hand. Whereas moral perfection can be achieved by resorting to desirelessness, spiritual discipline can only be perfected by meditation and contemplation as instructed by the spiritual teacher. If desirelessness is the ultimate end in Ethics, the bliss which one has by following the spiritual discipline is not due to acquiring material objects like wealth, progeny and fame. The source of this joy must

therefore be found in some supra-sensuous Reality, namely, the Ātman or God. Then, certainly, such supra-sensuous joy cannot be measured by any unit of the mundane pleasures.

A third important point which emerges out of what has been said above is regarding the supremacy of the Ātman or God. The Upaniṣadic seers have very ingeniously solved the problem by equating the two, and by further equating them with the Absolute. This they could do by eliminating one after another the various limitations, namely, the body, the mind, the senses, the intellect and egoism, as being no better than illusions or dreams. What remains, then, as a hard bed-rock is the reality of the Ātman as immanent, or the same entity known as God and as being transcendent, or as the Absolute when the two are synthesised. Thus they could easily jump from 'I am the Brahman' to 'This Ātman is Brahman', and from this again to 'All this is Brahman'. In short, the Upaniṣadic philosophy ends in positing an Idealistic Monism which fortunately does not end in Solipsism. But instead, it ends in Spiritual Altruism which teaches man to be loyal to God, to be one with Him, and to serve humanity in the spirit that it is the service to God.

In accomplishing this difficult task I have been immensely helped by my friend Mr. Jagannath Vyas, M.A., in various ways. He has gone through all the page-proofs of the volume very carefully and has prepared the Index, for which I cannot be too grateful to him. I must also mention here with thankfulness his son, Anand Kumar Vyas, who was ready to help me at my beck and call. My other two friends, Prof. Mohanlal Sharma and Prof. Mahaveer Prasad Vyas, deserve my thanks since occasionally they also used to help me in rechecking the proofs. Mr. Kanhayalal Joshi has put me under great obligation by getting the manuscript typed. It will be no exaggeration to say that by undertaking the publication of the two volumes of the *Upaniṣads Retold*, the Allied Publishers have brought the message of the Upaniṣads at the very doors of the aspiring souls. How can I omit to express my heart felt thankfulness to them?

I am glad that God has made me the instrument of fulfilling His Plan.

V.H. DATE

63 Jaswant Sarai
Jodhpur, Rajasthan
14 December 1978

Introduction

Two questions can generally be asked about any literary work: What does it contain? What is its use? An adequate answer to these is the justification of its existence and of its value. What have we to say about the necessity of retelling the Upaniṣads, especially in view of the incredible advance in technology and science and the tremendous growth of speculative philosophy and psychology? To fail to answer the two question is to confess to the attempt of reviving a dead horse.

The Upaniṣads contain what the empirical sciences do not contain and their usefulness is like that of a piece of sugarcandy to a blind man when it is put in his mouth. Sciences deal with what can be observed and measured by the senses, the mind, or the intellect, though the progress in ethics and metaphysics has been only speculative and attractive, as a cobweb. The Upaniṣads too are no doubt scientific in their approach in so far as their statements are capable of being observed and tested by personal experimentation and objective measurement and summed up as generalizations of the spiritual life. If science is valuable in ameliorating the material prosperity of man, and philosophy in producing the intellectual pleasure, the religion of the Upaniṣads is valuable in bringing the humanity at large in the common fold of kinship with God, by creating in them the bonds of mutual trust, fellow-feeling, and helpful love towards each other. Ethical theories and standards of behaviour may clash with each other, philosophical system can be found to be contradictory, and the conclusions of different sciences may not be coherent; but the Upaniṣadic spiritual worth of man will remain eternally the same, whether he is a Hindu or a Christian or of some other faith, for the simple reason that God is neither a Christian nor a Hindu.

Against this general background let us now look into the salient features of the Upaniṣads as they have been shown to us by the late Prof. R.D. Ranade, in his great work, *Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy*.

1. In the first place, the Upaniṣads are generally believed to be revealed; but what revelation means is that it is the spontaneous utterance of certain God-intoxicated sages.

2. The Upaniṣads give us a view of Reality which is supported by a direct, first-hand, intuitive, mystical experience which no science can impeach, which is the end of all philosophies, and which is the innermost truth of all religions.

3. They mark the transition from the Nature-gods to Self, from the hymnology to reflection, from henotheistic polytheism to monotheistic mysticism. No longer is there any fear of the wrath of the personified gods; and so, they mark the transition from emotion and imagination of the *Rgveda* to thought and reason of the post-Vedic period. Hence, the guardian of natural and moral order does not come from without, but springs from the Ātman who is the synthesis of what is both outside and inside, and who is veritably the ballast of nature.

4. The Ātman is the Ultimate category of existence to the Upaniṣadic seers. The Self must be regarded as the innermost existence, while the cosmological, physiological, and psychological elements are only external vestures which clothe the reality but which do not constitute it.

5. Hence, neither the bodily consciousness of the materialists, nor the "etheric double" of the Theosophists nor the sleeping consciousness which is really unconsciousness or ignorance, nor the twilight to the creative, dreaming state which is formed of imagination and memory, nor again the so-called sheaths made of food, *prāṇa*, mind, and knowledge, are able to define the Self. It is the pure, wakeful, blissful consciousness of itself and is therefore identical with God and the Brahman.

6. God then comes to be recognized as the immanent, the innermost, and the supreme soul of all other souls and the beings of the world. Like sparks from fire or like the thread emanating from the body of the spider, all the beings emanate from Him: God is therefore the Creator, the sustainer and the controller from within (the Antaryāmin) and the end of all.

7. As He is both immanent and transcendent, he must be realized in both these aspects. He must be realized not only as the in-dwelling Ātman or the Antaryāmin, but also as the transcendent Ātman, as the Bahiryaṁin. When both these aspects are seen as

identical with each other, one gets the double assurance that what he has realized is neither an illusion nor a projection of the creative mind, neither an after-image of the perception of some idol, nor a short-lived object of the external world.

8. And when the same Ātman or God is seen as smaller than the smallest and larger than the largest, as being very near and far off at the same time, everywhere and at all time, he is called the Absolute or the Brahman as transcending even the limitations of space and time.

9. And when further the Ātman is experienced as possessing various attributes, he is described as *Saguṇa Brahman* or God, but when he is experienced as not being limited by any one of the attributes, he becomes known as the *Nirguṇa Brahman*, or the Absolute and is then described in negative terms as "not this, not this". There are passages which describe the Brahman as possessing innumerable hands, feet, heads, eyes etc. and as being devoid of them all, and yet paradoxically, as the fastest of all, as seeing everything etc. in short, as being both static and dynamic.

10. The Ātman is said to be unknowable as an expression of humility, but this does not mean that he is unknowable as an agnostic would say. The Ātman is not a logical necessity as in Kant; it is the object of realization for the Upaniṣadic seers.

11. No doubt, if the Ātman is the eternal subject, he cannot be the object of the empirical knowledge of any one. But this will not prevent the Ātman to be the object of his own knowledge, just as one is not prevented from seeing one's own face in a mirror. The non-sensuous, eternal Ātman is capable of beholding himself outside the body as if he is divided into two—one the original and the other his reflection, just as the face in the mirror is the image of the human face before the mirror. The difference, however, is this. Whereas the face before the mirror is real, and that which appears inside the mirror is false, the Ātman within the body and the Ātman without the body are one and the same and is real both ways. The Upaniṣad defines the Ātman as the serene Being who emerging out of the body meets the light above and manifests in front of the mystic in his own immaculate form. There can be no two Ātmans, one inner and the other outer, one *Antaryāmin*, and the other *Bahiryāmin*, one immanent and the other transcendent Ātman. It is, however the presence of the body that creates the

feeling of the two aspects of the Ātman. In fact, the Ātman is one; and though in appearance he has the form of the body, it must be remembered that the immaculate Form is the Reality and that the physical body is only a shadow or a short-lived image of that Form. Hence the body is mortal, the Ātman is immortal and eternal.

12. If then the 'I' is identical with God and the Absolute, then the, 'Thou' also, by parity of reasoning, is identical with God and the Absolute. This means that the 'I' and the 'Thou' or what is the same thing as the self and the not-self, or the individual soul and the Nature outside (including the souls of my fellow-beings) are identical with God and so with each other. Thus are the pluralistic and the dualistic aspects of the worldly existence dissolved in the one, pantheistic, mystical Reality—call it as the Ātman or the Brahman. Theism is said to resolve the difference between Deism and Pantheism, between a transcendent God and an immanent God. But, this would be quite correct if the worshipper stands outside the two realms of Deism and Pantheism.

But if he discovers that he is the Ātman who is the worshipper and who is the worshipped, then it is in him that both transcendence and immanence will be resolved rather than he in any one of them. The Ātman would be the highest category of existence metaphysically, epistemologically, and psychologically. Nay, even ethically and mystically the Self-realization must be considered as the highest end of man, since the allurements of the not-self which are naturally ingrained in the human being are to be gradually weaned away and the Self is to be made to stand in its native purity and grandeur. As the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (I.14.8) tells us the Ātman is and ought to be the highest object of our desire, higher than progeny, higher than wealth or any other thing. Therefore, the realizer of the Ātman loves the Ātman; he plays and enjoys the company of the Ātman. And as he sees the Ātman everywhere and always, he goes beyond all duals, all grief, infatuation and misery. He lives in perpetual bliss and peace.

13. The Upaniṣads say with one voice that the realization of the Ātman or the Brahman will not be possible unless someone who has already realized the Brahman shows us the correct way and the method of meditation and contemplation on the Name or symbol of God such as *Om*. One who has lost his way on account of his being kidnapped and made blindfolded will require the help and

guidance of someone who is kind-hearted and who knows the way. The path of God-realization being the narrowest and the subtlest of all, one who wishes to travel on it will necessarily be in need of an expert guide. Without the grace of a spiritual teacher or the Guru one may wander and wander through the forest of Māyā till the end of one's life, but one will never be out of it.

14. In the interest of the highest development of which man's consciousness is capable, it is as impossible to divide metaphysics from morality, as it is to divide morality from spiritual life. Just as intelligence without morality might turn out to be sophistry, even so spiritual life without morality will be hypocrisy; while morality without the support of intelligence and spiritual discipline might become hollow and imperfect. If the metaphysical theory of the blissful Brahmanic life is to be a practical reality, none can afford to be indifferent to morality. If desirelessness is the sign of the highest bliss which is achievable by being one with the Brahman, it cannot then be measured in terms of happiness or joy attending upon the pleasures of progeny, wealth, or fame. The realization of the Ātman cannot be simply a theoretical ideal, an insipid and soul-less intellectual conviction; it means, as the great sage Yājñavalkya told his wife Maitreyī, that "the Ātman ought to be seen, ought to be heard, ought to be thought about and ought to be meditated upon." But in order to be able to contemplate upon the Ātman, mere intellectual understanding will not be enough. It must be backed up by a virtuous life. The transition from theory to practice, from metaphysics to mysticism, must be made through a self-imposed moral life of altruistic virtues.

15. And finally, when contemplation upon the divine Name becomes fruitful by the grace of the spiritual teacher as of God, and the mystic comes to realize the Ātman as Brahman, the earlier notions of an empirical 'I' and 'Thou' as well as of the 'Nature' outside appear to him as good as naught. Desires, doubts, fear, and infatuation vanish of themselves. In other words, when the 'I' in 'I am the Brahman', the 'thou' in 'That thou art', and the 'all' in 'All this is Brahman' vanish of themselves in the unique, blissful, and constant experience of the Ātman as being identical with the Brahman, there would remain no trace of the consciousness of the tiny individuality of a separate ego, no limitation of space and time, and no fear of any disease, old age, or death. A life of

immortality and limitless Ānanda even while one is living will be the divine reward for one who leads a morally good life and a life of spiritual meditation and contemplation on the divine Name and Form, respectively as instructed by the spiritual teacher. This is the eternal message of all the Upaniṣads; and this is the justification of retelling that message.

1

Īśāvāsyopaniṣad

Introduction

This smallest of the Upaniṣads consisting only of 18 verses is a compendium of almost all the teachings regarding the Brahman-vidyā and the way to realize it. The Īśāvāsyopaniṣad forms the 40th adhyāya of the Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā and is therefore known as the Saṁhitopaniṣad, just as the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad which belongs to the same Vājasaneyi branch is known as the Brāhmaṇopaniṣad. The benedictory verse which is common to both the Upaniṣads and is intended to express that the acquisition of the Brahman-vidyā would make a man free from the threefold afflictions of Saṁsāra, namely, ādhidaivika, ādhibhautika, and ādhyātmika, tells us in the very statement of it a twofold meaning regarding the nature of the Brahman. The generally accepted meaning is that Brahman as the cause of the world, and the world as the effect of Brahman are both perfect and infinite, and that when the effect is subtracted from the cause, what remains is the perfect Brahman. No doubt, this interpretation is supported by the great Śaṅkarācārya. But it must be remembered that from his viewpoint the world has not got the same status as that of the Brahman. The ornaments made of gold are, no doubt, as real as gold, says the Ācārya; but this is true with reference to the substance gold, and not with reference to the names and forms of the ornaments. That is why he asks us first to discover the cause in the effect, and then rejecting the effect to become one with the cause, namely, the Brahman. If one can make himself free and uncontaminated by the appearances of names and forms which are superimposed on account of avidyā (ignorance) upon the Reality, then even while he is in the midst of them he can be said to have lodged himself in the Brahman.

There is another interpretation which is equally unique and original as given to us by Professor R. D. Ranade. For him also Brahman is the cause; but he understands by effect not the world so much as the vision of the Ātman which too springs from the Brahman, and like the dissolution of salt back into

the sea, the Ātman becomes one with the Brahman. So, what remains after the dissolution of the salt of the Ātman, that is, what remains after the subtraction of the Ātman from the Brahman, is the ocean of the one infinite, perfect Brahman only. And once, the Brahman is realized, as the Ātman in all the beings, and all the beings in the Ātman, there can then be no grief or infatuation for him, as the verses 6 and 7 tell us.

Verses 4, 5 and 8 describe the nature of the Ātman. The senses cannot apprehend him. He is near at hand and far off; moves and moves not; is both immanent and transcendent; faster than the fastest mind; the cause of order and arrangement in Nature; neither gross nor subtle; the all-pervading spectator of all; the Self-effulgent, pure, immortal, eternal, and uncontaminated by sin or any other defect. The verse 15 says however that the real nature of this Ātman is covered by an attractive but false golden lid; and it will not be removed unless one prays to God, and receives His grace. What, after all, will be the fate of man if he does not realize the Ātman by doing morally good and virtuous deeds, as also by saying prayers to God and offering salutations to Him over and over again? He will be after his death only a heap of ashes, as the verse 17 warns us. Neither any karma as caused by avidyā, nor any proptiation (upāsana) of any deity as recommended by the so-called vidyās which are ultimately the forms of avidyā, will be of any help in enabling him to have his real freedom, though all his altruistic and benevolent actions and upāsana will be highly useful to him in his effort for God-realization. If anyone wishes to live for one hundred years, let it not be for the sake of doing such karma and upāsana as will ensure for him the pleasures of life in this and the worlds beyond, but let it be, as the first verse advises us, for the sake of being convinced that God it is who has covered all things in this world, and that it is He who gives us whatever we deserve. In short, what the Upaniṣad asks us to do is to remain content with our own lot and not to covet anything that belongs to others but to strive for realizing the Ātman.

Preview

1. The benedictory verse asks us to be one with Brahman and be free from afflictions of saṁsāra.
2. Whatever exists is pervaded by God. Sô, remain content with what is given by Him.
3. Those who have no knowledge of the Ātman wish to live for a hundred years and be engrossed in doing works.
4. Such persons are reserved for the regions of darkness.
5. It is by the command of the Ātman that all activity and order of things take place.
6. Contradictions of the Ātmanic life.
7. One should see the Ātman in all and all things in the Ātman.
8. He who becomes one with the Ātman and one with all becomes free from grief and infatuation.
9. Characteristics of the Ātman.
10. Avidyā means ignorance, while vidyā means upāsanā, or intellectual knowledge, or the Brahma-vidyā.
11. Real immortality consists in realizing the Brahman and not in being merged in Prakṛti.
12. Reality and truth are covered by appearances and falsehood respectively.
13. Removing the glittering false lid, see the real Puruṣa in yourself and in Nature.
14. If the Brahman is not realized, what is man except a heap of ashes ?
15. Rely then upon your morally good actions and make salutations to God.

Text with Comments

Om, that (Brahman) is perfect; this (Ātman) is perfect; the perfect springs out of the perfect; having taken away the perfect (Ātman) from the perfect (Brahman) what is left as remnant is the perfect (Brahman) only. Om; peace, peace, peace.

Comment

This is the benedictory verse, intended to bestow the peace of Brahman on man after freeing him from the threefold miseries due to the displeasure of gods, or to the hostile behaviour of man and other creatures, or to the diseases and worries of body and mind.

Brahman as the cause of the world is already infinite and perfect in all respects. This world which is ordinarily known as imperfect can also be found to be perfect, provided we look to the cause which is immanent in it. Like the ornament *made of gold*, the effect is always non-different from the cause. In like manner, as Professor R.D. Ranade interprets this passage,¹ if the Ātman, which is perfect and which derives its being from the Brahman, is subtracted from the infinite and perfect Brahman, what is left is the perfect and infinite Brahman only, though the Ātman as the effect is identical with the Brahman, as its cause and that the individual soul is identical with the Absolute.

In order that this life of the identity with Brahman and the consequent joy and peace might be achieved, the Upaniṣad tells us about the nature of Brahman, and the kind of attitude and behaviour we should adopt.

Whatever movable (or immovable) is in this world, all that should be clothed by (the presence of) God. Enjoy that which is (as if) left over by Him. Do not covet any object which belongs to others. 1

Comment

The very first verse gives us the main ingredients of spiritual life. In the first place, God must be experienced as enveloping

¹*Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy*, p. 277.

every object whether it is internal or external, movable or immovable. Awareness of God first and that of the things afterwards constitutes the pan-theistic attitude, with stress on the 'theos' rather than on the 'pan' (all).

Now, so far as the objects of this empirical, sensuous world are concerned, one need not suppose that they are to be necessarily and completely forsaken first, in order to experience the presence of God afterwards. For, God can be realized to some extent at least in spite of our being engrossed with the affairs of the world; and then, in the light of our divine experience and the joy due to it, we might be able to give up automatically the interest and the greed we were till then having for godless objects. Therefore, in the second place, the verse advises us to enjoy the objects of the world with restraint and reason. If at every moment and at every step, one were to remember that God is pervading his thoughts, speech and actions, as also the external objects, the result, in course of time, would be twofold. He would be free from the immoral life of having a lustful eye on the belongings of others and feel satisfied with the idea that the objects of his legitimate desires are as if the remnants left over at the end of a sacrifice on the altar of God. If he were also fortunate to have the vision of God at all times, he would be convinced that it is as if God who tastes the objects first and then allows His devotees to enjoy them. With all its sorrows and joys, life as a whole will then be nothing but a 'prasāda' of God, a free gift of grace, and not the punishment or reward of Fate. A life which is centred in God is bound to be gradually more and more altruistic and moral.

In fact, not only all the wealth and property that belongs to others but also that which belongs to oneself is owned by God. Man is only a trustee who is expected to use it as well as all his personal energies and the energies of others over which he has got control, for the divine purpose only. Wealth and physical strength need not be shunned and given up like a rag; but they should be utilized as great powers to lessen the miseries of mankind, and to propagate the doctrine of God's love for man. The verse therefore can be said to have advised us not to have the attitude of a greedy person even with reference to the wealth which we possess. One may accumulate it like a miser; but even in doing so, if one constantly remembers that it is being given to

one by God for fulfilling a divine purpose, one shall be generous in spending it for that very purpose, whenever the occasion would arise. Thus alone, shall he be able to clothe all that he is, and everything that he possesses and sees in this world, by the presence of God. And, thus alone, shall he be truly free from greed.

It is the saint who is able to cover the world by the vision of God and become free from greed. But, so long as we do not learn how to experience the presence of God, we should try our best to be as free as possible from greed. An intellectual conviction and an effort to make the life as a whole subservient to the realization of God, will go a long way in preparing us to have the bliss and peace of Brahman.

One might wish to live for a hundred years by doing actions only in this world; but only thus, and not otherwise than this (as referred to in verse 1) is there anyway for you; for thus alone no action will cling to a man. 2

Comment

More than a thousand years ago, during the time when Śrī Śaṅkarācārya lived, it must have been impossible for any thinker of the orthodox schools who believed in the infallible authority of the Vedas and in the institutions of the four Varṇas (castes) and the four Āśramas (stages in life) to ask the people to ignore the various distinctions of duties attached to them, and to convince them against their cherished notion that it was the doing of right and wrong, merit and demerit, and dharma and adharma as responsible for leading men into heaven or hell. Naturally, Śaṅkarācārya, too, who believed in the only Reality of the one, distinctionless Brahman and who took courage in his hands in recommending the fourth and the last āśrama, namely, the sannyāsa, straightway even after or during the first āśrama, namely, that of a Brahmacārī, had to say that the distinctions have their utility in the day-to-day, practical, and empirical life of man. He even admitted that the sacrificial cult, which was largely in vogue for propitiating various deities for mundane gains, was highly useful in preparing the mind to adopt the attitude of humility and surrender, of devotion and meditation, and in teaching man the lesson of sacrificing everything for the

Īśāvāsyopaniṣad, 2

sake of achieving the knowledge of God. He even accepted the distinction of the self from the Lord as a fact of personal experience. 'Notwithstanding the non-existence of distinctions, O Lord', says he 'I belong to thee, not thou to me. The wave belongs to the sea, and not the sea to the wave.'

All this would come to mean that the distinctions were not wholly tabooed by Śaṅkarācārya. He retained them as being very useful so far as the ethical and the spiritual processes are concerned. He was not at all against the utility of good, pious, and philanthropic works. He knew that they are all useful in bringing about the emergence of the knowledge of Brahman. But he would never allow that utility is the same as reality. The whole of the Karma-kāṇḍa including even the actions enjoined by the Vedas has its basis in avidyā or ignorance of the Reality. 'Unless the distinctions of caste, āśrama, age, etc. are superimposed upon the Ātman,' says he, 'there will be no possibility of the performance of a sacrifice by a Brahmin.¹ Besides, action differs from Brahma-Jnana in every respect; that is, in points of subject-matter and result. It requires an agent who has got his body and limbs and other instruments for performing it. It occurs in space and time; and one has to wait on several occasions to enjoy its fruit at a later moment of time. It may be, one has to ascend to heaven or descend into hell after death, or be born again in the animal or vegetable kingdom in order to taste the fruits of his actions. There may occur a number of impediments, miscalculations, and errors while performing a sacrifice, and the result might not only be as one had expected, but just the opposite of it. A single mistake in accent or an inadvertent but wrong substitution of a single syllable may cause any amount of harm. The substitution of 'bha' for 'ra' in the word 'rakṣatu' (may protect) and the uttering of the word as 'bhakṣatu' (may devour) in the prayer to the goddess, was responsible, as the anecdote tells us, for the death of the wife of a devotee, because he happened to utter, 'May the goddess Bhairavī devour my wife' (bhāryām Bhakṣatu Bhairavī). Besides, it is said that even gods become jealous and prevent a penance or sacrifice from being successfully performed. Moreover the actions bring about fruits which are after all shortlived; and there can be no guarantee that good

¹ His commentary on Brahma-Sūtras, I, 1, 1.

actions alone will be performed since man is liable to be influenced by the power of Evil.

The knowledge of the Brahman is just the opposite in character. In the very moment of its occurrence, there remains no such distinction as the so-called 'tripuṭī', or the threefold division of the knower, the known and the knowledge, or of the Kartā (doer), Karma and Kṛiya, or of the worshipper, the worshipped, and the worship. It is immediate, eternal, self-effulgent, untarnished, and incapable of being produced or prevented by the efforts of man. Therefore, as Śaṅkarācārya says, the knowledge of Brahman and human activity are absolutely different from each other; and so his metaphysical position remains unassailed, even though, epistemologically, and as he himself would grant from the human point of view, knowledge like conduct or character is to be achieved gradually and by degrees, and should therefore be regarded more as a process than as an event.

Notwithstanding the above, we need not suppose as Śaṅkarācārya does, that the first two verses of this Upaniṣad are addressed to two different kinds of people, namely, the Sannyāsins who have given themselves up to the pursuit of Brahman-jñāna only, and to those others who are so engrossed in their hunt after pleasures that they cannot shed their activities even for a short time. Śaṅkarācārya's attack against the latter is perfectly correct since no amount of activity will by itself ever give anyone the knowledge of Brahman, unless that activity is first motivated by a genuine aspiration to know God, and is turned to good account by making him less and less selfish, and more and more virtuous and pure at heart. In the absence of the aspiration to know God and the spiritual discipline in the form of devotional acts of meditation, what can be achieved even by the most disinterested acts, such as charity given in a sacrifice, penance, etc., would be only negative in character, from the viewpoint of the realization of God. If the spark of knowledge is not already there, what is the use of blowing over a heap of ashes of mere soul-less actions done throughout a hundred years? What we are told in the first verse is that the knowledge of God should cover everything in the universe, including the deeds of man; for, it is only when this condition is fulfilled that one can expect that the fuel of Karma would be burnt, and would not therefore bind the soul, as told in the second verse.

This means that there can be a novel way of having the combination (Samuccaya) of jaḍa and caitanya, of karma and jñāna, in spite of what Śaṅkarācārya correctly says in another sense that they cannot be so combined. If as the benedictory verse tells us, the Brahman exists in its unitary, pure, perfect, and infinite form with or without the existence of this universe, the knowledge of Brahman also, if once it is awakened in man, will never allow him to be stained by the impurities of karma, even though he is in the midst of intense activity. To an on-looker it may appear that a Brahmajñānī is being sullied by the good and evil effects of his deeds; but no sooner does he come out of his works than he is seen to be as illumined as he was before. As a matter of fact, he remains illumined even while he is engaged in doing the works. It is in this way that he can as if divide his attention and combine both knowledge and action. Or, we may say that in the focus of his consciousness he will have the presence of God, while with his marginal consciousness he would be active. Or, again changing the metaphor, we may say that while his surface consciousness is directed to the doing of works, his consciousness below is always wedded to the contemplation of God. Thus, would he always make a sacrifice of his actions in the fire of his knowledge of God, or what is the same thing, as clothing his actions by the mantle of the presence of God.

There is another way still to accomplish this combination of jñāna and karma, though this too is foreign to the spirit of the philosophy of Śaṅkarācārya. Instead of having simultaneously the double consciousness namely, one focal and the other marginal, of God and of the affairs of the world, one can alternate the two consciousnesses, successively. One can meditate on God and feel His presence before and after a particular activity, and cover it on both sides by divine consciousness. And if this practice is continued regularly and for a long time, it would gradually make the aspirant feel the presence of God even while he is doing actions, or as the *Bhagavadgītā* tells us (2.48), even while he lives as a 'Yogastha'.

Now, when Śaṅkarācārya tells us that action and knowledge can never be combined, he is arguing from a different point of view, namely, that of the Brahman or the Absolute, and not so much from the human or the temporal point of view. When one attains to Brahman, that is, when one gets the consciousness of

being identical with Brahman, or as the 6th and 7th verses tell us, when one would see all the beings in the Ātman and the Ātman in all the beings, sorrow, infatuation, jealousy, etc., would of themselves fall away from him. Naturally, in the absence of motives, actions also will not take place. Such moments of God-intoxication or complete absorption in Brahman, known as the moments of Samādhi, are very few in life. The senses then become immediately withdrawn from all objects other than God, mind becomes steady and concentrated on the vision of God; and the organs of action cease to be active. In other words, as Śaṅkarācārya insists upon saying, karma ceases to operate the moment there is Brahma-jñāna, just as darkness ceases to exist the moment there comes light. What the Upaniṣad aims at is to point out that, inasmuch as it is impossible for man to remain absorbed in the unitive life of Brahman throughout the day and night, and inasmuch as he lives in a society and has therefore to discharge and fulfil various kinds of duties and obligations, the only course open to him is to combine both karma and jñāna in one of the two ways we have discussed above, and endow his works with the light, the energy, and the joy of the Caitanya. Thus, by being in constant touch with God, he can do his several duties even for one hundred years in an impersonal and disinterested manner and yet be free from their effects, because he would be doing them with the consciousness that they are ordained by God and are being done by the power of God. He would think that he is merely an instrument of God, and then realize ultimately that God is enveloping him and his works, and fulfilling His mission as he likes. But what would be the fate of a God-less person is narrated in the verse third.

Those are indeed the Sunless worlds covered by pitchy darkness; and to these, the people who kill their souls go after they die. 3

Comment

The Brahman or the Ātman is the Sun of Reality, and if the forceful, conscious rays of this Sun are not allowed to penetrate deep into the soul of man, he can be said, even while he is alive, to have made his habitat in the pitchy darkness of ignorance or

avidyā. Turning his back against the eternal and immortal Brahman, he kills his very soul, so to say. No wonder, if he continues to stay in that very condition of ignorance even after his death. A God-less life of intense and altruistic activity even for a period of one hundred years is nothing short of the death of the soul, and as such, is neither a substitute nor an alternative choice for enjoying the presence of God, who is on all sides of all things and activities and thoughts. Hence occurs the endless saṁsāra of births and deaths, and of trips to heaven and to hell.

As against these ephemeral, perpetual changes in the conditions of the soul, the steadfast character of the Brahman and of the person who knows the Brahman are brought out in the next five verses, from 4 to 8.

That One though unmoving, is swifter than the mind: the gods (i.e., the senses) do not reach it; though it is stationary, it surpasses others even if they run; (due to its support) the wind arranges the functions of water (fire and other elements). 4

That moves, that moves not; that is far away, that is also near at hand; that is inside of this all, that is also outside of this all. 5

Comment

These two verses as well as verse 8 describe the characteristics of the Ultimate Reality which is called the Ātman or the Brahman. Verses 4 and 5 tell us in contradictory terms that the Brahman is and is not amenable to change. Naturally, this has become one of the most controversial points in the whole of the Vedānta, and has divided philosophers into two opposite camps who believe that Brahman is either static, nirguṇa, and nirupādhika, or dynamic, saṁguṇa, and sopādhika. Śaṅkarācārya, however, has reconciled in his own peculiar way the two conflicting views about the nature of Brahman, but has shown his uncompromising attitude in maintaining that it is the unchanging, nirguṇa Brahman alone which is the ultimate Reality. The qualities and the upādhis are not totally unreal or illusory like a barren woman's son or a mirage; but being short-lived and mutable, they are, from his point of view, less real, and so dependent for their very existence on the nirguṇa and the changeless Brahman only. Being in no way inferior to either Rāmānujācārya, Madh-

vācārya, or Vallabhācārya in being a theist of a very high order, he could hardly sacrifice the legitimate position of the saṁgha Brahman or God to whom allegiance, reverence, worship, and surrender are due, and which have been, on account of the divine grace added on to them, of perpetual help in advancing the cause of the realization of the nirguṇa Brahman also. Vain are therefore, the attacks of the upholders of the dualistic theism against the non-dualistic, monistic type of mysticism of Śāṅkarācārya. Those who are slow to understand that there can be utmost devotion even in Advaita, or that theism must culminate in mysticism, or that the more the similarity the more the life of absolute identity, may take pride in putting forth logical and verbal arguments against the position which goes far beyond logic and words. Those who really care for both the elements of theism and mysticism in the one common life of God-realization through devotion, will necessarily discover that both the saṁgha and the nirguṇa aspects of Brahman are equally real and indispensable for the growth and stability of any spiritual life worth the name. Śāṅkarācārya being one such person is careful enough not to sacrifice the saṁgha on the altar of the nirguṇa; but on the other hand, he shows its importance and utility for the emergence of the knowledge of the identity of the individual soul with the nirguṇa Brahman. His doctrine of Māyā, instead of being an hindrance in the process of the asymptotic approximation to Reality, as Professor R. D. Ranade would like to put it, serves the double purpose, as we have seen in our earlier work,¹ of preventing us from falling into the pitfalls and dangers of the Cidvilāsavāda, and enabling us to rise step by step on the spiritual ladder, from the experience of 'I am the Brahman' to that of 'All this is Brahman', even though we have to accept the Vivartavāda in preference to Parīṇāmavāda. Both the views point out, no doubt, that Brahman is the cause of the world and that we should first know the cause as different from the effect, and then leaving the effect, so concentrate our attention on the cause that ultimately we shall become identified with the cause, namely, the Brahman, and enjoy its peace and bliss. But it is likely that one may falsely identify the cause with the effect, instead of identifying the effect with the cause. Naturally, while in the for-

¹*Vedānta Explained*, Vol. II, Pp. 496 to 501.

mer case, it is more likely than not to forget the cause altogether and be so immersed in the effects that one may not know that he is being insensibly and gradually driven away from the eternal joy of Brahman (the cause) to the fleeting joys of the sensuous objects. In the latter case, it will just be opposite. One will turn away one's attention from whatever is fleeting, changing and shortlived, as if it is a dream or a mirage, or like a false snake on a rope, and concentrate one's attention on the adhiṣṭhāna, that is, the support and the cause of them which is nothing but the unchanging Brahman.

In view of this, there will be no difficulty in understanding why in explaining the contradictory nature of the Brahman as mentioned in the two verses, namely, that it is faster than the mind and the senses even though it is stationary, or that it moves and moves not, Śaṅkarācārya introduces the word (ivā) meaning 'as if', and says that the phenomenon of motion is only an epiphenomenon on the static and unchanging nature of Brahman. It is like the snake on the rope, or like silver on the shell, and appears on Brahman on account of its being associated with the upādhis of body, mind, senses, intellect, and the objects. The logic is unassailable. For, if we suppose that Brahman also moves like other things, we shall have to give up the hypothesis that it is all-pervading, one and indivisible, and accept that it too like other things can have locomotion, change, transformation, etc., and can therefore be overcome by disease, decay, and death. Brahma-vidyā would in that case come to an end.

The upholders of the dynamic view of Brahman might take their stand upon the 'mahāvākya', namely, 'All this is Brahman', and contend against Śaṅkarācārya that the Reality is manifold also, and not simply one. And, inasmuch as the world is not different from Brahman, it is but the personal or the Saguna aspect of Brahman which is amenable to change. It is to bring out this truth, they might say, that verse 5 speaks about it as responsible for enabling Vāyu to arrange and supervise the economy of nature. The causal nexus responsible for the creation, maintenance, and destruction of the universe, as well as the ethico-spiritual progress of man requires a Personal God who takes different attitudes towards them and acts according as they deserve.

The reply to this is not however difficult to find. Where is this

'all' from the viewpoint of Brahmanubhava? The word 'all' loses its face-value the moment all things in the world are experienced as forms of Brahman, just as the ornaments can be said to lose their several names and forms the moment they are recognized as nothing but gold, or just as the ripples have no substantive existence of their own apart from the water on which they appear. And, then, in the absence of the 'all' or 'many', the phenomenal appearance of the Brahman as being active and moving in accordance with the casual necessities and the several motives and activities of man and other beings, ceases to exist. What remains is the pure, blissful consciousness of the one, immutable, nirguṇa Brahman. And, this alone then is the real destiny of man according to the Advaita Vedānta.

We have our own say in the matter. We have however no urge to fight the battle exclusively on logical grounds; we wish to offer a solution of the problem from the viewpoints of epistemology and psychology. It is the concrete experience of God-realization and the expression of it by saints that shall be our guide in the matter. In the Kantian fashion, it is the human mind that should be applied to determine the nature of the divine, though it may escape us and transcend far beyond our discovery about it. Not logic so much but epistemology and psychology will be the key to our metaphysical judgements about God or Brahman. What man knows and feels about God as the result of his long and constant devotion to Him, as well as due to his ethico-spiritual discipline as taught by his Master, is the minimum he can say with certainty about God. Looked at from this point of view, the Upaniṣadic teachings must not be considered as simply the dogmas of speculative reasoning, but as expressions of the actual experience of Brahman.

Along with this, if we remember what Professor Ranade has correctly said that Brahmanubhava is a 'process and not an event,' the contradictory statements with regard to Brahman need not baffle us at all. Just as gold can be transformed into various forms without any change in its essential nature, even so Brahman may manifest itself in several forms and in various degrees of colour, beauty, and splendour, and yet remain the same. The important point to note is that though the innumerable manifestations of God are as real as God, they can neither exist nor can they be real without the prior existence of God.

One who sees all the beings in the Ātman (after he first sees the Ātman) and sees the Ātman as being immanent in all the beings, does not hate anyone, (since he has his eye on the Ātman only). 6

Comment

This and the next verse define the essential characteristics of the Ātmajñāna and its effect on one who has realized it. The expression 'anupaśyati' is important. It means 'sees after'. But what is that which is seen first and that which is seen after? The first line of the verse tells us that all the beings are seen afterwards, and that they are seen in the Ātman. So, what is or what ought to be seen first is the Ātman, whose nature has already been defined partially in the fifth verse, but which will be made more explicit in the eighth verse. People become conscious of the beings and objects of the world only; they do not become generally aware of the Ātman at all. At the most they have only an intellectual understanding about God. A romantic poet of the pantheistic leanings becomes emotionally stirred up when he looks at Nature and feels that it is 'informed by the spirit of God', as Wordsworth would like to put it. But he becomes conscious of the world first. His advance, however, over the practical, pragmatic judgement of the common man consists not only in giving an intellectual consent to those who say that God exists, but also in going beyond it and proclaiming that the power of God is immanent in the world. As opposed to the common man and the Nature-poet, the mystic, as the Upaniṣad tells us in this verse, sees the Ātman first, and then sees all the beings as existing in the Ātman. No doubt, he too is a pantheist. But, his pantheism consists in going from *theos* (God) to the *pan* (all, meaning the world), and not from the pan to the theos, as the poet might feel. Further, whereas the progress of the poet does not go beyond a feeling regarding the presence of God in all things, the God-realized person sees the vision of God in all things and at all times. From God to all, and back from all to God are his constant flights. And though he becomes aware of all, he becomes aware of them as forms or manifestations of God, just as the goldsmith, in being aware of the ornaments of gold, has his eye on gold only. Whatever may be the name and form of the orna-

ment, he sees only the metal gold in it, and not the name and the form of the ornament which he knows are transitory, and as imposed upon gold. And when he looks at gold, he also knows that it can be transformed into any ornament of any name and form. Even so, whatever may be the persons or the objects which the realized person might come across, his eye will be upon the Ātman or the Reality within them and not upon the names and forms.

And if, as pointed out in verse 4, the Ātman is *one* only, and as pointed out in verse 5, the Ātman is both inside and outside of things and without being discontinuous, it goes without saying that all the beings which are said to be seen in the Ātman, according to verse 6, are nothing but the Ātman, and that what exists inside the beings is also nothing else but the Ātman. In short, from the beginning to the end, or from the inner-most core of things to whatever might envelop them, it is one continuous, homogeneous Ātman. If, in other words, the Ātman is the self-effulgent, immaculate Form of one's own self, the beings which are seen in the Ātman are also the resplendent, immaculate forms or manifestations of the same Ātman. That is why, the saints all over the world are reputed to have seen not only the disembodied forms corresponding to their physical bodies, but also other various disembodied forms, such as that of a swan, a camel, a horse, a fish, a dog, a child, a star, a crescent moon, and so on and so forth. The Ātman is one, in spite of being many; he is static and permanently the same in spite of his power to change himself into other things, and the power to move all, without being himself moved.

How can there arise infatuation and grief in him for whom all the beings have become the Ātman only, and who sees them all as one entity? 7

Comment

Infatuation and grief, and by implication, pleasure and pain arise as motives and effects of good and bad deeds; and then as reactions of these, there arise again new desires and new motives for actions and for their fruits. These again will lead to grief or pleasure, and so on. To arrest this chain of motives, actions and

effects, the verse suggests the remedy to realize the unity of the Ātman even while one is bound by that chain. No doubt, one will necessarily engage himself in actions of one kind or the other, so long as he is alive. But if the actions will be disinterested even at the stage of motives, whatever fruit they will yield, will then neither make him too much dejected nor joyful. The verse does not intend to tell us that there should neither be in us the sense of inactivity nor the sense of being bound by social and natural environment. It only intends to teach us that if one has his gaze constantly upon the Ātman, whatever he may do or whatever circumstances he is in, then neither activity nor inactivity nor again the upādhi of being amidst the various kinds of environment will affect him in any way. Being in constant touch with the Ātman, he will ever be blissful by virtue of his having transcended all the dualities such as joy and grief, and all the apparent plurality of other beings in the world. There is no 'other' to him except the Ātman, and as such he is not afraid of any being, not even of death.

That Ātman is all-pervading, pure, having neither the subtle nor the gross body, imperishable, spotless on account of there being no desires, sinless, that is, not being affected by either dharma or adharma, the omniscient spectator of all, the best of all, and self-existing. It is he who has distributed the duties even to the eternal Prajāpatīs known as Samvatsaras, according to their capacities.

8

Those who worship avidyā enter into pitchy darkness; but those who are engrossed in vidyā enter into greater darkness. What we have heard from the wise is that vidyā and avidyā have their different results. However, one who practises vidyā and avidyā together, goes beyond death by means of avidyā and attains immortality by means of vidyā. 9-11

Comment

It is very difficult to say who of the several interpreters of these three verses as well as of the next three verses is correct, since all the points which require explanation are not thoroughly dealt with by anyone. Instead of therefore going into discussion as to who has interpreted them in what manner, and how far each

one of them is correct, let us be satisfied by giving our own interpretation, keeping in our mind however what Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and Professor R. D. Ranade have said about them. We have to be very careful about the meanings of the words vidyā and avidyā, so that there will be no doubt regarding how one of them will lead the soul into pitchy darkness and enable it to go beyond death, and how the other will lead the soul into greater darkness and yet confer immortality upon it. To begin with, we have to say that the word 'Vidyā' is ambiguous in meaning. It means the knowledge of a particular upāsanā or worship of a particular deity; but it also means either the verbal or the intellectual knowledge of the Reality known as Ātman or Brahman, or the concrete and direct realization of that Reality. The upāsanās of Udgītha (Om), of Vāyu and of Agni are known as Udgītha-vidyā, Vāyu-vidyā and Agni-vidyā respectively. Similarly, the word Brahma-vidyā may mean either the intellectual knowledge (śabda-jñāna) about the nature of Brahman or the Brahmānubhava, that is, the realization of Brahman. So far as the first meaning, namely upāsanā is concerned, we can say that vidyā can easily be associated with the sacrificial karma, especially when it becomes a part of a particular ritual in a sacrifice. Now, a karma of this kind, for instance, even the Aśvamedha sacrifice which is considered as the highest and the best karma, is said to be only transitory or as overcome by death. So, excepting the upāsanā part of it, all karma is said to be due to avidyā which means ignorance of the Reality or Brahman. We therefore have come to one definite point, namely, that vidyā in the sense of Brahmānubhava is the opposite of avidyā, but that it is compatible with avidyā inasmuch as vidyā in the sense of upāsanā of a particular deity can be combined or not with karma, and that it is also compatible with the śabdayajñāna or the mere verbal knowledge about the Brahman.

As we have already known from verse 7 that the immediate result of Brahmānubhava is the removal of 'moha' and 'śoka', it is clear that it cannot be combined with any ritualistic karma the fruit of which is to be had in some future moment of time. Nor can it be combined with any upāsanā though it is a kind of vidyā; because the very conception of upāsanā, though it is based on the recognition of the distinction between one who does the upāsanā and the deity which is worshipped. At the best, the upā-

saka might become one with the deity; but the deity itself is far from realizing the unity with the Brahman. Even the Prajāpati or the Hiranyagarbha who is said to be the first-born indicates only the limit of saṁsāra, but does not go beyond it. Besides, the fruits of the upāsana in the form of progeny, prosperity, etc. are given by the Paramātmān and not by the deities. No deity would like that its upāsaka should strive after the realization of the Brahman. Hence, the conclusion is that avidyā means that which binds a man by desires, ignorance, 'moha' and 'śoka', though karmas like Agnihotra, sacrifices, charity and penances, are recommended as the means of purification. But, in their turn, they create new desires, new actions and new fruits, and so become the cause of moha and śoka. Thus, avidyā will only be useful in satisfying the desires of a man and in enabling him to go beyond death to heaven or to some other world, but it will never be able to make him realize the Brahman.

So far as the Vidyā in the sense of upāsana of a deity is concerned, it will enable him to become a citizen of the domain of the deity, or at best enable him to become one with that deity. But, as we have said above, he will not have the realization of the Brahman, and so will never have the real, eternal and the immortal life of Brahman, though from the human point of view, we might say by courtesy that gods enjoy an immortal life, that is, a life which may be a thousand or a million times longer than the life of man.

Now, why it is said in the verse that while those who follow avidyā only enter into pitchy darkness will be clear if by avidyā we understand ignorance or darkness. But why should vidyā (upāsana) be considered as greater darkness? It is knowledge no doubt, but it is of a particular deity only. All knowledge is of the nature of light, but the knowledge of a deity is a borrowed light of the Brahman. Besides, the upāsaka is in close vicinity (upāsana) of the deity who protects and favours him by granting him his desired objects. But it should be noted that the light which he gets is a passing light; and that the glory and the prosperity which he gets is equally transitory. When the merit is exhausted, he shall have to vacate his seat near the deity, part with all his glory, and return to the mortal world, the land of karma. One who is engrossed in doing the karma only is at least certain about the fruits he would get; but the upāsaka

becomes dependent on the will of the gods. Besides, he becomes puffed up with pride and egoism when he is favoured by his deity. When that support goes away, he has to suffer a sudden fall into darkness, ignorance, misery and sorrow.

Those who worship the Prakṛti enter into pitchy darkness; in greater darkness still enter those who are engrossed in what has been produced. We have heard from the wise who have explained to us that different are the fruits of sambhūti and vināśa. (But) one who wishes to worship both the Prakṛti and that which is born from it goes beyond death by means of the latter, and attains immortality by means of the former. 12-14

Comment

The words 'asambhūti' and 'sambhūti' in verse 12 are replaced by 'asambhava' and 'sambhava' in verse 13. But, there is a sudden change in verse, 14. Vināśa (destruction) is used for sambhūti of verses 12 and 13; but the word 'sambhūti' in the first and the second lines of verse 14, if it is to mean anything, ought to be replaced by the word 'asambhūti'. That is, an 'a' must be prefixed to it in both the places so that it will mean the Prakṛti, which is the cause of that which is produced for being destroyed only.

'Asambhūti' in verse 12 means that which has no sambhūti. Being unborn, it is incapable of being produced. Of this nature there are only two entities. One is the Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhyas, and the other, the Parabrahma of the Vedāntins. But as the context is similar and continuous with that of Vidyā and avidyā, there cannot be any possibility of Brahman being the subject of inquiry in these three verses. So, what is meant by 'asambhūti' is the Prakṛti, the dissolution or merging in which is spoken of as the 'Amṛta' or the condition of immortality. This kind of immortality has however only a nominal value; for during the evolution of Prakṛti there will again be the emergence of the self-same guṇas, egoism (ahaṃkāra), mahat etc. which go to form the body, the senses and the mind of the individual beings and of their saṃsāra. The real immortality will be the union of the soul with the Puruṣa, of which the Sāṃkhyas have a theoretical knowledge only. For, after all, their method of elimination and

reversing the process of evolution has no direct connection with the Puruṣa, the realization of whom they also prize so much in theory. Just as you descend, so do you ascend. They are the same steps which either lead you forward in the course of evolution, or in the reverse way, to Prakṛti which is through and through non-sentient, but which presents the show of blind activity on account of the presence of the Puruṣa.

Like-wise, the word 'sambhūti' in verse 12 which means the world which is produced as an effect of Prakṛti as its cause is referred to again as 'Sambhava' in verse 13, and as 'Vināśa' (destruction) in verse 14. And yet it is said that it leads a man beyond death. We must note that even Prajāpati or Hiranya-garbhā whose worship is believed to have the power of conferring prosperity and glory on man is not exempted from death. Naturally, even those who worship him and go beyond death into heaven or into other worlds for the sake of enjoying the best things of human life, become subject to death and decay as soon as their merit is exhausted. They do not cross death in the sense that they become once for all free from death; they only postpone it. The real freedom from death and the real immortality come from the realization of the Brahman. In short, whether Prakṛti and Prajāpati are worshipped separately or jointly, the result would be the same, namely, identity of the soul with the jaḍa i.e. Prakṛti-laya. This is the same as the conclusion we have reached from the consideration of verses 9 to 11, whether we do the karma (avidyā) only, or combine it with upāsanā (vidyā) with the view to fulfilling our desires. What all the six verses tell us then is that with all our actions and our upāsanās and intellectual knowledge to support them, we shall only be moving in the domain of saṁsāra, and that all our talk about freedom from death and about immortality will amount to useless prattle, unless we resort to the practice of spiritual discipline as taught by the Guru and the scriptures and realizing the Brahman, put an end to our desires and the consequent misery and grief.

The mouth (the doors) of the Brahman (who resides in the Sun) is closed by a lid which shines as if it is made of gold. Therefore, remove it, O, Sun, so that I who wish to follow the path of Truth should realize it (as existing in you). 15

57982

Comment

The truth, namely, the Brahman, is hidden from the sight of the people in general. It is covered by the lid in the form of saṁsāra as caused by avidyā which, though false, shines as if it is made of gold and thereby tempts the man. But, I wish to realize the Truth which, as I have heard, resides in the Sun. Therefore, O Sun, be kind unto me by removing the lid and show me the treasure which lies concealed in you.

O you, who nourish the world, who are moving alone in the sky, who control this all, who sucks up prāṇa and rasa, and you who are the son of Prajāpati, and who therefore are known as Pūṣan, Ekaṛṣi, Yama, Sūrya, and Prājāpatya, collect all your rays together, and so diminish their brilliance and heat, that I might be able to behold your most auspicious form. I make this prayer to you because (I have heard) that the Puruṣa in you is the same who lives as the Ātman in me. 16

Comment

Leaving aside then the mere ritualistic sacrificial method of pleasing gods and the method of worshipping them in order that they should fulfil one's desires of this and of the next world after death; leaving aside, in other words, mere sacrificial karma, mere upāsana, or the combination of them both as discussed in the verses 9 to 14, what the real aspirant would like to do after achieving the Brahma-jñāna is to pray to the Brahman that he should favour him in such a way as to enable him to see that the Self in him is identical with the Puruṣa (Brahman) in the disc of the Sun. The content of such possible prayers is described in the verses 15 to 18. As prayer is one of the most essential ingredients of the spiritual life, and as the mystical experience is the direct and immediate contact and union with the Reality, the prayer also is addressed to that Reality or the Brahman, and not to any intermediary deities as is commonly done in a theistic prayer. The prayer in these four verses is for experiencing the identity (saḥ ahaṁ asmi) as expressed in the verse 15, and not for the purpose of any material gain.

The breath (in me) will merge into the immortal Wind; and as for this body, it will be turned into ashes. Therefore, O Prājāpatya, (kindly) remember me and the (good) actions I might have done. 17

Comment

The Vāyu or the breathing which supports the whole of life constitutes in essence the subtle body (the *linga* or the *sūkṣma deha*), which is said to transmigrate from one body to another. This body itself turns into ashes after the vāyu has left it. So, what the aspirant wishes to achieve by his prayer to the Prājāpatya is that before his subtle body transmigrates to another body, he should take into consideration only the good deeds of the aspirant, and put him on the pathway to the Brahman. Otherwise, the fear which the aspirant wants to express is that he would be moving from death to death.

O, Agni, thou who art the knower of all our actions, lead us by the excellent way so that we may reap the fruits of them; but destroy (at the same time) all our deceitful sins. What we can now do (at the time of departure from the body) is to express our reverence for you by means of salutations only. 18

Comment

And, now, finally, the prayer is addressed to the fire, inasmuch as in the preceding verse only the body is referred as that which will be turned into ashes. The aspirant now prays that not only his body should be burnt, but that his sins and his deceit also should be burnt, so that the remaining portion of his actions, namely the good actions, should enable the fire to lead the soul by the path leading to the treasure of Brahmanubhava. What, however, is that 'Supatha'? It might be said that it is the 'northern' path in preference to the 'southern' one. But, when, in view of what has been told in the verse 16, namely, that the individual soul is identical with the person in the Sun, one can raise the questions whether, in that condition of the experience of Identity which can be had

even during the life-time of a man and before his death, there can be any sense of direction for the person in the Sun, and whether it can be said that the prāṇas of a realized soul rise at all after death and be waiting to go by the northern or the southern path. The Upaniṣad (Br. 3.2.11) is emphatic on the point that the prāṇas of such a person do not rise and depart after death, but that they become united with the Brahman even while he is living. The 'Supatha' then ought to mean the correct (su) and the only way (patha) of realizing the Brahman.

It is no defect that the prayer is made to the Agni and not to the Sun; for, the Agni is nothing but the representative of the Sun on the earth. That is why one can see the resplendent and the beautiful Person not only in the Sun but in the fire also, whether that fire is the sacrificial one or one on the cremation ground. And, if the prayer be of a dying man who is conscious that his body would soon be reduced to ashes, as the verse 17 says, and naturally, as there would not perhaps be much time between the prayer and the passing away of life, the only worship which can possibly be done at that time is bowing down one's head before fire. But when this also becomes physically impossible, the last alternative is to prostrate at the feet of God mentally only. Verily, Namaskāra (salutation) is the highest form of worship, because it is at once the symbol of surrender, faith, and love.

Retrospect

The fortieth adhyāya of the Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā is known as the Īśāvāsyopaniṣad. The benedictory verse at the start contains the important idea, as pointed out by Professor R.D. Ranade, that if the Ātman, which is perfect and which springs out of the perfect and infinite Brahman, is subtracted from the Brahman, what remains is the infinite Brahman again. And then, the very first verse of the Upaniṣad gives us the entire sum and substance of the spiritual life as a whole, as also the nature of the moral conduct which is very necessary to support that life. Whatever one is and has both internally and externally, and whatever exists in the world must be looked upon as enveloped by God. Then, as a result of this pantheistic attitude one shall feel that whatever he enjoys by means of his senses is nothing but a gift of God. How then will he cast a covetous glance on what belongs to others? But so long as one does not get the experience of the all-pervading vision of God, he should try to be content with whatever he has, and remember God both before and after each and every thought, speech or deed. In this way, as the second verse points out, he can combine both knowledge and karma, and desire to live for one hundred years. In the focus of consciousness there will then be the presence of God, while his marginal consciousness would be devoted to the activity of the senses. In fact, to be constantly aware of the presence of God itself amounts to intense activity. Or, it is just possible in the case of a God-realized person that action and contemplation alternate one another in quick succession. But in case there is no spark of spiritual knowledge, what is the good of having a long life of one hundred years? Will the blowing of the ashes of karma ever produce the fire of the knowledge of Brahman? Would there be a combination of light and darkness, as Śaṅkarācārya would like to put it? It is to impress this lesson upon the mind that the third verse tells us that those who are averse to the knowledge of God go to dwell in the dark regions where dwell the demons or the Asuras. Even a life of Godless, intense and altruistic activity for one hundred years is no substitute for a life which is centred in God.

The next five verses, from 4 to 8, describe the characteristics of the Brahman as must have been experienced by a realized soul. The power of the Brahman to reach any distant object with a

speed greater than that of the mind without itself being moved, to make the senses and the elements of fire, water etc., function in several ways, to manifest simultaneously near at hand and far away in the self same, identical manner, and to be both immanent and transcendent, is unique and unlimited. Naturally, one who has the direct experience of this all, and sees all the beings in the Ātman and the Ātman in all the beings, is never affected by sorrow, grief or infatuation. He has before him always the vision of the Ātman as bereft of the subtle and the gross bodies. He becomes pure, omniscient and sinless, because there would then be no difference between the Brahman and the realizer of the Brahman.

The next six verses, from 9 to 14, show us how by doing karma only one might go beyond death to other worlds, how those who do upāsanā with or without the help of karma go to reside in the regions of the deities, but how all of them enter into pitchy darkness, while how those who follow the instruction of the Guru, become able to realize the Brahman and attain to the real, immortal life. It is this kind of Brahmanic life which, we are told, is altogether different from one which consists in being merged into Prakṛti. It should be noted in this connection that for the correct understanding of these six verses, one must understand the exact meanings of the words avidyā, vidyā and amṛta. Vidyā in the sense of intellectual knowledge or upāsanā can very easily be combined either with the karma-kāṇḍa or with the jñāna-kāṇḍa. But in doing so there is the danger of mixing its attendant evil of egoism either with the actions or with the Brahmanubhava. In the former the darkness of ignorance will be increased; in the latter the light of the realization of Brahman will be dimmed. Bereft of egoism, both the intellectual knowledge and upāsanā, if they are coupled with karma, will be able to purify the mind of the doer of works; while if they are coupled with the ethico-spiritual discipline, they will several times make the realization of Brahman easier than before. Vidyā then will be transformed into su-vidyā, that is into that form of excellent vidyā which would confer the real immortality and freedom (amṛtam) upon the sādḥaka.

2

Kenopaniṣad

(A Brāhmaṇopaniṣad of the Talavakara branch
of the Sāmaveda)

Introduction

The two benedictory verses which occur at the beginning of the Upaniṣad are endowed with excellent meaning. The first verse tells us that none who is on the path of the Brahman should be jealous of his spiritual teacher or of his spiritual brothers. For, the illumination of the Brahman shines equally on all, and has got the power to protect them all. The second verse tells us that one should pray to God to endow him with a sound body and sound senses, so that he would be able to tread on the path of the Brahman with ease and comfort. He should pray that he be saved from all the afflictions of saṁsāra, so that he will have no occasion to turn away from the spiritual path and lose the grace of God. For, then alone will he enjoy the bliss of realizing the Ātman and of realizing that the Brahman is the Ātman of all things and beings in the universe.

Śaṅkarācārya's introduction to the Upaniṣad begins with the obvious reference to the Īsopaniṣad and the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad where we are told that those who perform works only go by the southern path after death, but return again to the mortal world; and that those who combine works with the knowledge of upāsanās remain after death in the regions of the particular deities whom they had worshipped, and are liberated along with them gradually; but that those who get themselves merged in the Ātman even before death do not return to the mortal world.

It is on this background that the teachings of the Upaniṣad are unfolded only to those who wish to extricate themselves from the snares of saṁsāra after avoiding the pitfalls and dangers in it. The followers of the Mimāṃsaka school of thought, who are mainly interested in performing actions according to the injunctions and prohibitions of the Karma-kāṇḍa in order to fulfil their desires for having pleasures in this and in the worlds beyond, do not care to understand the nature of Ātman

whom they only assume as being different from the physical body and the senses. What the Upaniṣad wishes to point out to the aspirant of the Brahma-vidyā is that karma is possible only in the state of avidyā or the ignorance about the Ātman, and that so long as there are kāma, karma and avidyā, there would be no freedom from saṁsāra. It accepts, no doubt, that the performance of sacrifice, penance and the giving away of wealth are useful in purifying the mind, and that the upāsanaś (worship) of deities are useful in winning their favours. But all this has got its own limitations, and so has no purpose to serve for him who has realized the Brahman. As the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa says, the Ātma-yāji is superior to Devayāji, because while the former will live the life of union with Brahman, the latter cannot.

People know that a chariot moves and are interested in its movement, but they hardly care to know who it is who moves the chariot. Even so, people observe that the prāṇa, the mind, and the senses do their functions, but hardly are they aware of the Ātman, who being at the back of them all, is the real cause of thinking, seeing, hearing, etc. The Upaniṣad tells us that the Ātman who is beyond the reach of the mind and the senses is the mover of them all. To consider the Ātman as endowed with qualities, actions, relations, and class-names, as the Naiyāyikas do, is to treat him as a perishable thing like jars and pieces of cloth. The Ātman is self-existing and self-illuminating, while the body and the senses are jaḍa and dependent upon the borrowed light of the Ātman. The jīva who uses them as instruments of the knowledge of the phenomenal world considers himself to be the knower, whereas he too like the instruments and the objects is shortlived only. As a matter of fact, the jīva is none else but the Ātman or the Brahman; but due to his contact with buddhi, he begins to believe falsely in the reality of whatever is shown to him by buddhi and the senses, and so forgets his own real nature. It is due to the various super-impositions of the mind, buddhi, senses and the egoism of man that he believes in what he really is not. Just as the Sun who has nothing to do with the existence or the non-existence of the world, continues simply to shine, even so the Self-effulgent, eternal Caitanya—call it Ātman or Brahman—has nothing to do either with the known effects and the unknown causes of the phenomenal world, or with the ignorance (avidyā) and

the realization (vidyā) of the Reality by the jīva. The author of the Upaniṣad is filled with pity for the erring humanity and tells them to worship the Ātman by the very act of realizing Him, and not to worship anything else, that is, whatever is shown by the senses, the mind and the intellect.

Another important point as given by the Upaniṣad is that inasmuch as the Brahman is immanent in all the things of the world, each one of the sensuous experience ought to be an occasion for a wise man to discover the presence of Brahman. He may not be able to wipe out completely all the avidyā at one stroke; but relying on the instruction of the spiritual teacher he must do so as often as he can. He should try to get himself free from all desires, and with great courage, self-control, absence of egoism, peace of mind and faith, discover the presence of the Brahman in each and every sensuous experience, just as the immanence of fire is capable of being discovered in all the heated objects. Then alone there will be real immortality and freedom from the fear of death.

An important question which emerges in the context of the victory of the gods over the demons is: if the Brahman cannot be the object of worship, how can anyone say that Brahman (Īśvara) got the victory for the sake of the gods? The reply is that the author of the Upaniṣad now wishes to introduce the worship, not so much of the inanimate entities such as the body, senses, etc., or that of the divinities presiding over them, but of the Brahman itself under the ādhidaivika and the ādhyātmika aspects of it. For it is the Saṁgha Brahman, the omniscient and the omnipotent Paramātmā, known also as the Īśvara, due to whose grace one can have not only power and victory, but also mokṣa or liberation that is, identity with the Nirguṇa Brahman. To say with the Mimāṃsakas that karma and Apūrva are able to account for the mysterious arrangement and order of the universe and of the distribution of rewards according to deserts, and thereby avoid the contingency of making God partial and cruel will not solve the problem of misery and inequality in the world. For Karma itself, according to the Mimāṃsakas themselves, would have at its door the charge of being jaḍa, and as such, would require an intelligent and conscious mover for making it and its instruments active and potent. If this were not true, the plough itself would gather the harvest and carry it to the owner's house.

God (Saguṇa Brahman) then is the giver of the fruits of karma. It is in order to expound this truth that the allegory of the three gods, Fire, Wind and Indra, on the one hand, and the Saguṇa Brahman, on the other, is introduced in the Upaniṣad. Fire and Wind became unable to burn and blow off a blade of grass which represented the Brahman. Indra, on the contrary, who became humble was graced by the Guru, and he came to know and realize the Brahma-vidyā.

Preview

1. It is the Ātman who inspires the mind and senseorgans to do their respective functions of thinking, hearing, seeing, speaking and breathing.
2. The Ātman is the Prāṇa of prāṇas, the Mind of mind, the Ear of ears, the Eye of eyes, and the Speech of speech.
3. Just as hotness of water is due to the borrowed heat of fire, even so the power to think, to hear etc. is the borrowed power of the Ātman. The wise realize the Ātman and become immortal.
4. The Ātman is beyond the reach of the senses, mind, intellect, learning and inference. Not only it is beyond the phenomenal knowledge, but also beyond the unknowable.
5. Yet, the Ātman or the Brahman can be directly realized by one who follows the instruction of the spiritual teacher and silently meditates upon what is imparted by him.
6. For him, who does not care to realize the Brahman in this very human life, there is reserved complete destruction.
7. Gods became puffed up with pride and could not understand that their victory over the demons was due to the power of Brahman.
8. Unlike Fire and Wind who could neither burn nor blow away a blade of grass, Indra was humble and so he could meet the Guru, who then imparted to him the knowledge of Brahman.
9. The ādhidaivata and the ādhyātmika are the aspects of the manifestation of the power of Brahman in Nature and in Man.
10. None who is incapable of practising penance and restraint, and who does not possess the virtues of truth, self-sacrifice and humility, should ever hope to realize the Brahman-vidyā.

Text with Comments

Let the highest Ātman protect my spiritual teacher and myself; let him enable us both to enjoy (the spiritual bliss); may we both achieve together the power (of Brahma-vidyā); may our spiritual study illumine us with its meaning and may we never be jealous of each other. 1

Let the limbs of my body, as also all my senses including speech, prāṇa, eyes, and ears be perfectly sound (for achieving Brahma-vidyā); that which has been described in all the Upaniṣads is the Brahman alone; let me not turn my back on the Brahman, and let not the Brahman turn away from me; let me not be cast away by Brahman, let me not be cast away; and let all the characteristics of the Ātman, as are described in the Upaniṣads, come to reside in me on account of my being devoted to the Ātman. Om, let there be peace, peace and eternal peace, and no more any kind of affliction. 2

Comment

In our earlier works (Īsopaniṣad and the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad) we have thoroughly discussed the nature, the knowledge, and the worship of the Prāṇa, along with several other kinds of karma. We have also seen how the performers of works only go by the southern path after death, but return again to the mortal world; how those who combine works with knowledge go by the northern path to the regions of the gods whom they worship, and remaining there for a long time, become liberated along with the particular deity at the time of the dissolution of the world; and how those who follow only the path of Ātma-jñāna become merged in the Ātman and never return to the mortal world again. Now begins this first Adhyāya (Khaṇḍa) of the Kenopaniṣad, with the view to explain the nature for the Ātman to him, whose mind has been purified by the doing of good actions along with the knowledge of them, who has no desire for fruits, who has become conscious of the pitfalls and the dangers of saṁsāra, and who therefore has cherished the earnest desire of removing the ignorance which has become the main obstacle in realizing the Ātman (Brahman). As the Ātman

is unknown, and as what is known is only the knowledge of the un-ātman which refers to the human body and other things, it is very necessary that the desire to know the Ātman must be satisfied. This cannot be done by the Mīmāṃsakas whose interest lies in performing actions only and who therefore have no aspiration to know the Ātman, except assuming that He is different from the body and the senses and that He is capable of being connected with the pleasures or pains beyond death. The knowledge of the Ātman however is in direct opposition to works. That knowledge is described in the Upaniṣads, and the Ātman is shown as the same as Brahman. For instance, in this very Upaniṣad, the Brahman will be pointed out as that which has a unique character of its own, and not that which is being worshipped in this or that way. One who has realized that he is the Brahman, that is, one who has realized the Ātmajñāna will never salute anyone else; nor will he be compelled to do any action which aims at achieving some desired fruit inasmuch as there occurs no desire in him which remains unfulfilled.

What then, a Mīmāṃsaka asks, is the propriety of saying that works done without any motive to obtain the fruits are useful, if Brahmajñāna is directly opposed to the doing of actions? Will it not be proper to say that no kind of work should be begun at all, just as it would be wise to be away from dirt than to get it splashed first on the body and to wash it away afterwards? The reply is that all this is true in a way. But the doing of Karma is possible only in the state of avidyā; limited are the fruits of it, and it does bind a man who is full of desires. However, in the case of one who does the works without attachment to the fruits, they make the soul potent with dispositions (saṃskāras) which make him in course of time fit for achieving the knowledge of the Brahman. That is why we get in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the statement that the Ātmayājī that is one who worships the deities and performs sacrifices for the sake of purifying one's soul and not with the view to attain to heaven, is far better than the Devayājī that is one who performs sacrifices and worships the deities in order to win their favours and thereby fulfil his desires. The Bhagavadgītā also says (18.5) that performance of sacrifices, charity and penance go to purify the soul of a man. They wipe away the sins which prevent one from realizing the Ātmajñāna, by cleansing the mirror of their soul, and making it fit to have

in it the image of the Ātman. In short, works must be done by those who are immersed in ignorance; but for those who have realized the Brahman, they have no purpose to serve.

Reasoning also will be helpful in arriving at the same conclusion. Of what use is a boat to him who has once already crossed the river? He will necessarily abandon it. Even so, one who has achieved liberation as the fruit of the realization of the Ātman has nothing to gain by doing the works. For, the existence of the Ātman is already an accomplished fact; he is not to be manufactured by some means or other; nor can he be considered as modifiable in some way; he is eternal, imperishable and disembodied; the everlasting subject and the Self of all. Works may be done; but there will neither be increase nor decrease in his nature; much less will the impressions (*saṁskāras*) of works alter him in any way. Therefore, it is for the sake of those who have given up looking outside and have turned their gaze inside that the instruction of this Upaniṣad is begun.

Om. By whose will is it (*Īṣita*) that the mind is drawn towards objects? Impelled (*preṣita*) by whom does the Prāṇa begin to function first of all? Whose wish is it which makes the people speak? And what God is that who orders the eyes and the ears (to do their respective functions)? 1

Comment

What is observed in the daily, common life is that inanimate objects like a chariot move only when there is some animate cause as their mover. The regular movement, therefore, of the equally inanimate mind and the senses suggests that there must also be some animate cause behind it. What that definite cause must be is the question of a disciple who not being satisfied by being told in a general way that there must be some non-specific cause responsible for the various functions of the mind, and the senses. The words '*Īṣita*' and '*Preṣita*' in the Śruti passage above, which literally mean 'desired' and 'sent for', respectively, would convey the idea that the Ātman too is like some human being, a preceptor, for instance, who having certain desires and wishing to fulfil them orders his disciple to bring flowers and material for sacrifice. But, as it has been shown in

earlier works, any thing which is endowed with the quality of doing action is transitory. The Ātman however is eternal and does not do anything. So, the words 'iṣita' and 'preṣita' suggest that the mere wish and the vicinity of the Ātman are sufficient to make the senses and the mind do their respective functions. The senses, however, make us aware of the objects; that much only is their inherent capacity. The power of movement they derive is from the Prāṇa or the wind in which it is always present as an inherent quality. But whence does this power of the prāṇa to move come; of what nature is that God who makes it move, and enables the tongue, the eyes and the ears to speak, to see and to hear respectively? These are the questions of the disciple.

That impelling (Ātman) is the Ear of the ears, the Mind of the mind, the Speech of the speech, the Prāṇa of the prāṇa, and the Eye of the eyes. (Realizing him) those who are wise get themselves liberated while departing from the body, and become immortal. 2

Comment

What this passage aims at is to show that the undifferentiated Ātman is the efficient cause of all the activities of the mind, the prāṇa and the other senses. For, to say with the Naiyāyikas that he is endowed with qualities, actions, relations and class-names is to treat him like the perishable things such as jars and pieces of cloth. To call him undifferentiated is not to say that he is non-existent. For, there remains then no reason to account for the different kinds of sensuous knowledge which can never be said to be due to the non-sentient sense-organs. In fact, the sensibility of the senses, that is the power to sense the particular object, such as the meaning of words, cannot be inherent as a natural characteristic of the ear, unless it becomes united with the Ātman and borrows its illumination. Whereas the Ātman is self-existing and self-illuminating, the senses are dependent on it for the sake of both existence and illumination. Just as boiling water burns, though the capacity to burn is inherent in fire and not in water, even so the capacity to understand and manifest the meanings of the objects is said to belong to the various senses in spite of their

being non-sentient, and shortlived, though in fact it belongs to the Ātman. The senses then have no more capacity than what is borrowed from the Ātman. The jīva also who uses the senses as instruments of knowledge and who is in contact with buddhi becomes known as the knower of the sensible world. But he too is, on that very account, transitory in nature. The Ātman, on the other hand, as the witness of that knowledge is the only eternal, undifferentiated knower and the source of that knowledge.

As for the liberation which the wise men achieve from the saṁsāra which is super-imposed on the Ātman on account of the buddhi and other upādhis, it should be noted that inasmuch as their ignorance (avidyā) about the Ātman is burnt away by Vidyā or the realization of the Ātman, there occurs no cause or occasion for the doing of actions, and as such, no occasion for having a new physical body in a birth after death. Not that the jīvas were bound first, and then became free. In fact they were already free; but owing to the ignorance of the Ātman, they wrongly thought they were subject to birth and death. But no sooner the wise among them realized the Ātman than they knew that they were immortal and free already.

The eye does not reach there; neither the speech nor the mind can have any access to it. How that Ātman controls and gives directions to the senses and the mind is not known to us. For, what we have heard formerly from the preceptors who had preached us about him is that he is altogether different both from what is known and what is unknown. 3

Comment

The Ātman being very subtle, the disciple could neither see him nor think about him mentally. Not only is the Ātman beyond the reach of the senses, but he is also different from all the manifest objects of the world which are transitory, heterogeneous and known by different people in different ways. If then, he is not any one of the sensibly knowable objects, can we call him as unknowable? But this is also not possible, since the Ātman, who knows himself, does not stand in need of any other subject who knows him. In fact, he being self-existent and self-knowing, to say that he must be aspiring to know himself is also inadequate.

How can the subject become also the object? Can a lamp which is self-illuminating require another lamp for being manifested? Though people might use a lamp for removing darkness, the lamp does not require the presence of darkness for being itself illuminated. It illumines whether there is darkness or not; but it shows by its illumination that there is the absence of darkness. Even so, there being nothing heterogeneous in or outside the Brahman who is ever self-effulgent, there cannot be any possibility on the part of the Ātman to be aware about any other thing, whether known or unknown, in order to have self-knowledge and self-illumination.

One might contend that if Brahman is not concerned with the knowledge of anyone else, then the instruction of the scripture as well as the experience of those who have realized the Brahman would surely be contradicted. But the contention is not correct. For, it will then refer only to the jīva (soul), that is to the Ātman under limitations (Upādhis), and not to the upādhiless Ātman or Brahman. The knowledge of the jīva, though he is called by the dignified name, Ātman, is limited and shortlived; for, he wrongly appropriates for himself all that which does not belong to the Ātman, namely the body, the buddhi, and the senses; so he and imagines that he is the Ātman. Thus, arbitrarily limiting the Caitanya by the wall of ignorance, and assuming that whatever is shown by buddhi and the senses is infallible, he becomes known as the subject of the apparent, phenomenal knowledge of oneself being a Brahmin, or a learned man, and so on. The jīvātman therefore is altogether different from the undifferentiated and the eternal knower, namely, the Brahman. But who can help, if the thoughtless people understand the sopādhika, un-ātman, the jīva, as the real Ātman? So there would be no contradiction in saying that both the false knowledge and the aspiration to realize the Reality arise in the mind of the sopādhika ātman (i.e., the jīva) only. It is impossible that they can arise in the upādhiless Caitanya or the real Ātman.

This would silence the objection that experience of the realized people is contradicted. But what about the objection that scriptural evidence is contradicted by saying that Vijñāna does not require Vijñāna for its own knowledge? How can otherwise the instruction, 'That (Brahman) Thou art', be at all be fruitful? The jīva indicated by the word 'thou' may not be fit to realize

the Brahman; and yet, if the instruction carries any meaning at all, it must be supposed that it is meant for the Brahman who remains as the core of reality after the upādhis are shorn out of the jīva or are removed from the word 'thou'. Besides, like the Sun who can never be illumined by anything else, if the Brahman is eternally of the nature of Jñāna, the instruction also serves no purpose. The reply is that this is not so. The instruction is meant for the removal of the superimpositions of the various attributes made upon the Ātman, on account of the limitations of body, mind, intellect, and the senses, and thereby enable one to experience the pure nature of the Ātman alone as distinct and independent of them all.

Another important question that arises in this connection is as to who it is who can be said to cause superimposition on the Ātman. It cannot be the Ātman himself; for, he is the locus on which the superimposition takes place. It can neither be the inconscient things; the shell will not cause the superimposition of silver upon itself. No doubt, the crystal appears red on account of the proximity of a red flower; but here also the redness in the white crystal is not superimposed by the flower. In all such cases it is some human being who experiences the illusion. This occurs not necessarily because he is the author of the superimposition of one thing on another, but because the real nature of things is hidden on account of some or other reason. The reflection of the moon becomes unsteady, as soon as the upādhi of water in which it appears, becomes unsteady. This means that the superimposition and the illusion caused by it occur only in the Caitanya which is limited by some upādhi. Apart from these incidental superimpositions which take place, there is also a very important psycho-metaphysical kind of superimposition which takes place due to the variations in the buddhi and the ahaṁkāra of man. The Ātman is ever pure and unaffected, and the real nature of the jīva also is the same. But due to the upādhis of buddhi, senses and ahaṁkāra, man forgets his real nature and supposes that he is either happy or miserable, bound or free. This is the superimposition he makes on the Ātman, and then supposes that he is only a jīva and not the Ātman. It is this false knowledge about himself which, we may call, is due to avidyā or ignorance of the Ātman; and it is this that is to be removed by the instruction regarding the real

knowledge of the Ātman, which, we may call the Vidyā. In short, the instruction about the realization of the Ātman is meant for the jīva, who in spite of his being already the Ātman has forgotten that he is so on account of the various limitations which have been imposed on the Ātman.

The opponent might now grant that the ignorance of the Ātman due to the superimpositions of the upādhis is possible only on the recognition of the fact that the Ātman is the self-illuminating Caitanya. He would accept, in other words, that the Ātman is beyond what is known (Vidita), though it is falsely created or manifested (Vyakta). But he would still like to know how the Ātman is beyond what is unknown (avidita), that is, beyond the cause which is unmanifest (avyakta). The reply is that though we ordinarily say that the Sun is shining on the world, he being always of the nature of light has nothing to do with the existence or non-existence of the world. Even so the Ātman who is eternally the self-effulgent Caitanya has nothing to do with the false show of the avidyā (vidita or known) or with the realization of the Ātman (vidyā) which remains generally unknown (avidita). The Sun shines whether or not there are objects: the Brahman illumines whether the jivas are merged in ignorance or have realized the Ātman. The Brahman being the Ātman of all is not something which can be accepted or rejected by the will of man. This will be possible only when there are two things; but there is nothing else, but Brahman.

All this, as the Śruti passage intends to point out, is what the spiritual teacher also has heard by way of tradition from his earlier teachers, generations after generations. In other words, what it intends to suggest is that the earlier preceptors also have not told anything new by way of imagination and inference, but that they have merely expounded the truth which was carried unto them by tradition only. Inferential knowledge is more often than not insecure, and is due to wrong conceptions. The knowledge of the Brahman, on the other hand, is to be directly imparted by the Guru to his disciple, and is also to be realized directly, so that the knower of Brahman would become Brahman.

Know him that alone as the Brahman by whose power the tongue speaks, but whom it is unable to manifest. So, that is not the Brahman whom the people worship. (4) Know him alone as

the Brahman by whose power the mind thinks, but about whom the mind is unable to think. So, that is not the Brahman whom the people worship.(5) Know him alone as the Brahman by whose power the eye sees, but whom the eye does not see. So, that is not the Brahman whom the people worship.(6) Know him alone as the Brahman by whose power the ear hears, but whom the ear does not hear. So, that is not the Brahman whom the people worship.(7) Know him alone as Brahman by whose power breathing goes on, but whose life is not dependent on prāṇa. So, that is not the Brahman whom the people worship.(8)

Comment

Brahman alone is the source of power which is required for the proper functioning of all the senses, mind and prāṇa. Brahman alone is the Ātman of all, while everything else is un-ātman. What the people in general worship is something which belongs to the world of the un-ātman, and not the Brahman who is eternally knowledge only. That undifferentiated Brahman is to be realized as being identical with the real nature of the jiva, and so is not to be considered as simply an object of worship, as if it is on a par with other sensuous and mental objects which are, one and all, un-ātman in character. The ever-lasting subject can never be thought of as an object to be worshipped.

(Here ends the first Khaṇḍa of the Kenopaniṣad.)

KHAṆḌA TWO

Even if you think that the Brahman is known perfectly, you have only a little knowledge about him. Nay, if someone among the gods were to say that he knows the Brahman very well, he too knows him only a little. If then the Brahman is known partially, it follows that you have further to think about him exceedingly well. 1

I do not think that I know the Brahman very well; nor do I think that I do not know. What I think is that I know and do not know; for, whoever amongst us knows that the Brahman is

different from what is known and what is unknown, alone knows him. 2

Comment

What is intended to be conveyed is that the preceptor wishes to know if the disciple has properly understood or not what he had preached him, namely, that Brahman cannot be the object of worship by any means, since it is beyond what is both known and unknown, and that therefore if one wishes to know the Brahman well, whether he is a man or a god, he must think and think again and over again till he realizes him. The disciple is told that whatever a man or a god may know about Brahman amounts to a little knowledge. In response to his teacher's statement, what the disciple says in the first and in the second passages is that his experience of the nature of Brahman is identically the same as that of his Guru, as also the same which is put forth by the scriptural evidence, namely, that the Brahman is beyond both the known and the unknown. This, the disciple knows, since he too is of the same eternal nature as of the Brahman, namely, the self-effulgent consciousness which is impossible to be contradicted by any kind of false knowledge.

One who knows that the Ātman cannot be known because the Ātman can never become the object in the process of knowing alone comes to realize him. But he who thinks that the Ātman is obtainable like other sensuous objects will never realize him. He who has realized the Ātman, knows that it is neither obtainable nor knowable like other objects, but to him who thinks that he knows the Brahman, the Ātman remains ever unknown. 3

Comment

This is the verdict of the Śruti after what has been told regarding the conversation between the preceptor and the disciple. The Brahman cannot be perceived by the senses, and so, he is described as being different from the phenomenal knowledge. But one who has realized the Brahman as his own Ātman can say that he knows him. He is the real knower; and for him there is no necessity of doing any action. On the other hand, one who says that

he has known the Brahman falls outside the knowledge of Brahman, and knows only what is not Brahman. The desire for the realization of the Brahman cannot be satisfied by what the logicians such as Kapila and Kaṇāda have told us; and so, their teachings lead us only to false knowledge. That is why to the people who are ignorant, the Brahman appears as superimposed by the upādhis of buddhi and the senses. Whatever is given to them in sensuous experience by the buddhi and the senses, and whatever is understood by them as connected by the law of causation, is falsely believed by them as the knowledge of Brahman, just as those who have not seen the rope are likely to be illuded by the appearance of a serpent on it.

That is the true opinion according to which the Ātman is capable of being realized during all the experiences afforded by the intellect (pratibodha). Thereby alone is attained immortality; thereby also the power which can defy even the dread of death. Therefore it is that the Ātmavidyā will enable one to attain immortality. 4

Comment

Just as fire which remains immanent in the red-hot iron is different from the iron, even so the Brahman which is immanent in all the experiences afforded by the senses, the mind and the intellect of man, is altogether different and independent of them all. Whatever might be the nature of the sensuous experiences, each one of them should be an occasion for realizing the Ātman who pervades them all and who gives even the seeming reality to those experiences and manifests them all. If, on the contrary, one were to consider that all the sensuous experiences of the phenomenal world which arise on account of the activities of the senses, mind, prāṇa, and buddhi, constitute the Ātman, he would be overtaken by the fear of death. Ātmajñāna does not create immortality, just as the worship of some deity produces some result. Otherwise, immortality also would be as transient as any other result of activity. What Ātmajñāna does is to remove the fear of death; and it is this fearlessness of death that is known as immortality. The jñāna or the vidyā of the Ātman, being the opposite of ajñāna (ignorance) or avidyā, it has got such a great

power that it vanquishes not only the dualistic feeling created by ignorance, but even the force of the prārabdha karma and that of the Māyā of God.

The word 'Pratibodha' may also have two meanings besides its obvious meaning, namely, 'each and every bodha (experience)'. One may have it once only and be able to wipe out all avidyā at one stroke, just as no sooner one gets up from sleep than he puts a stop to his dreaming condition. Or, Pratibodha may mean the instruction of the spiritual teacher. And yet, there cannot be the direct realization of the Brahman unless one is alert to find out that the Ātman is pervading each and every experience gained through the senses, the mind, and the buddhi.

He alone will arrive at truth who will realize (the Ātman) while he is living on this earth; but if he does not so realize he will meet with great ruin, those who are wise do realize the immanence of the Ātman in each and every being, and so, while departing from this world they have already attained to immortality. 5

Comment

Man can be said to have made his life fruitful, if he realizes the Ātman during his life-time. Otherwise, he would never be able to get away from the rounds of birth and death. What, therefore, the wise man does is first to discover the presence of the Ātman in all the beings, and then after seeing Him as transcending them all realize him as identical with his very self. This he does with great courage, and making himself free from all the desires of the sensuous life, leaves his body and the world, and becomes one with the Brahman.

(Here ends the second khaṇḍa of the Kenopaniṣad.)

KHAṆḌA THREE

The Brahman (Īśvara) got victory over the asuras for the sake of gods. It was due to this victory of the Brahman that the gods became prosperous.

In this and in the next Khaṇḍa is narrated an allegory in order to show that the realization of the Brahman is very difficult to achieve, and that therefore an aspirant must toil hard before he

can expect to have it. Another motive of introducing this much Vedic portion as Arthavāda which is primarily meant for praising the Brahmanvidyā is to show the utmost necessity of having self-control, absence of egoism, peace of mind, disgust for worldly affairs, and the preparedness for looking within oneself, as means to obtain the Vidyā. One might think that this would contradict what is told in the first khaṇḍa, namely that Brahman cannot be the object of upāsana, as is possible in the case of other deities. But there, the motive was to describe the nature of the Nirguṇa Brahman; here the motive is to describe the Saguṇa Brahman and the mode of worshipping the same under the two aspects, namely, the Adhidaiva and Adhyātma. Therefore the word 'Brahma' in the Śruti passage should be understood as meaning the omniscient and omnipotent Paramātmān or Īśvara. Otherwise who else would have the power to vanquish both Fire and Wind, as we shall presently see.

Now, there rages a battle between Śaṅkarācārya and his opponents regarding the very existence of God. Śaṅkarācārya asserts that the whole economy of Nature and the uniform activity of it are a sufficient proof that God exists and is the cause of them. No doubt, says he, that there is scriptural evidence as to why one should believe in the existence of God; but so long as it is not supported by reasoning, people might take that evidence simply as an Arthavāda intended for the sake of praise only. This universe which consists of heaven and earth, and of the sun, the moon, the planets and the stars in the sky; which affords ample scope for people in different places to use different means for enjoying pleasures; which is so wonderful as cannot be produced even by the best of the skilled sculptures; and in which the fixed order of events and the conjunction of time, space and circumstances is brought about in such a mysterious manner, that it would be impossible for anyone to think that it is there without the planning and purpose of an active and conscient Being. But surely he cannot be the finite and the transmigratory soul of any human being; for, it is beyond the capacity of man to know what karma has been done by what particular individual, and to bring in thereby the most astounding variety in the creation of the universe. Therefore, such an omniscient and omnipotent Being must be none else but God.

At this, a Mīmāṃsaka might say that if Karma alone is able to account for the mysterious arrangement of the world, what additional gain would there be in saying that God is the cause of it? Inconceivable is the power of Karma; and it is accepted on all hands that Karma is the cause of its fruits (results or effects). Why should one exaggerate the importance of God who is not at all the cause of any karma or of its fruits? On the contrary, in putting forth this claim, one runs the risk of making God partial and cruel, because there is inequality between man and man, and because there is abundant misery in the world it is impossible, comes the reply, that karma which is dependent on some active being for its being done, should by itself be the cause of the variety of fruits. Nor can the individual jīva who is finite and who also is bound by the limitations of place, time, environment and circumstances direct the karma to produce for him particular kinds of fruit. Especially, it looks strange that he should be unable to avoid misery as the fruit of his karma.

The Saugata (Bauddha) joins the fray. Holding the view that the life of the Vijñānamaya Ātman lasts only for a moment, he says that the karma done by the Ātman may be able to bear the fruits even after the death of a man just as a magnet may be able to attract the iron at any time. But this is wrong. In the first place, it is known to all that any kind of karma cannot be said to have been done at all, unless it has been in constant touch not only with the instruments used in doing the karma but also with the doer of it. If, however, in the second place, we go with the belief that the Ātman has a, momentary existence, there would be two absurd conclusions. The Ātman might do a karma, but might not live till he gets the fruits of it; or he may not do anything and yet be forced to bear the consequences of the actions of some one else who might have died long before a new tman comes on the scene. The Lokāyatikas make a slight change in the argument of the Bauddha and say that karma is done and supported by the elements, that is by the senses which are produced out of the elements. They may no longer be needed by the doer of the actions, and may simply be left aside as if they were the instruments like a plough which is of no use after the land is ploughed. But how can either the karma or the senses, both of which are inanimate, have inherent

tendency to move and act? Does the plough pick up the harvest and reach it to the owner's house?

There comes then the modern version of the view of the Mīmāṃsakas. According to them even the Vedic instruction tells us that the fruit of an action depends on the action itself and does not require any additional help from God. For instance, one who wishes to attain the heaven is required to perform a sacrifice only; for this he is not asked to depend on God. Of course, if anyone wishes to know how a sacrifice which is performed today will be able to give fruit after a long time and in a different region, namely the heaven, the Mīmāṃsakas reply that they believe in the existence of 'Apūrva', which means that the fruit of the sacrifice remains awaiting till the performer of the sacrifice goes into the heaven.

Experience, however, is against this. Karma is of two kinds; one, the fruit of which is perceivable, and the other, the fruit of which is imperceivable. The first again is of two kinds. One, the fruit of which is obtained simultaneously along with the doing of the action, and the other, after the action is done. The place of destination where one has to go on foot is reached gradually; whereas the satisfaction of having dined comes after the dinner is finished. So where the fruit of an action is not perceived because it is obtainable after a long time, it becomes necessary that it should be made available by someone other than the doer of the action. One employed in the fields is paid for his labour by his master. Similarly, it will be proper to say that God is the giver of the fruits of sacrifices which have been already performed. As God is the Self of all, He is the witness of all actions, fruits, and experiences; and as He is the very Knowledge incarnate, and so uncontaminated by any of the attributes of this fleeting saṃsāra, there cannot be any real and fundamental difference between the jivas who are controlled and God the controller of them. Otherwise, both of them would be as transitory as the ordinary things of the world. This will also be enough to prevent us from believing in the notion that God is like a king who favours some people but is not well disposed to others. For, one who is the truthful witness of all will never do injustice to anyone even in ordinary life. What then to say about God who is ever free from love and hatred? The king too like God thinks it to be his duty

to protect the good and to punish the evil minded. As a matter of fact, to say that God is the witness of all is only by way of courtesy. For, though he is eternally of the nature of consciousness, the various objects of experience are transitory and unreal. So, the act of witnessing them on the part of God is also not real. Similarly, His identity with the jīvas which resembles the false identity of the original with the reflection, being also unreal. He is not contaminated by the blemishes of the saṁsāra just as the original remains unaffected by the changes in the reflection.

The existence of God is not proved by reasoning only. Several passages from the Śruti tell us that 'the Paramātman who is altogether different from all beings is not affected by the miseries of the world'; 'He goes beyond old age and death'; 'He does not enjoy the fruits of actions but only looks on'; 'The Sun and the moon obey the behest of this immutable Ātman'. Add to these passages from the Smṛti also, such as, 'God lives in the hearts of all': 'He is equal to all beings'. It will be wrong to call these passages as merely Arthavāda sentences; for, they are neither found in the context of any action, nor are they of the nature of injunctions. They are as self-valid as the sentences in the Karma-kāṇḍa, though they refer to the knowledge of the Brahman. Besides, nowhere in the Śruti there is any sentence which speaks about the non-existence of God, or of his inability to distribute the fruits according to merit. Just as a king can give a reward to his servant for his service, even so God who is conscious of the works done by men may give rewards or punishment as they deserve.

After refuting the arguments of the atheistic Mīmāṃsakas, Śaṅkarācārya turns his attention to the theists in whose opinion also the distinction between the individual soul and God is real. He points out how the Śruti tells us without any ambiguity that there is none else but God who can be called as the seer, the hearer and the thinker, inasmuch as he is the Self of all beings (Br.3.7.23). Even the great statement, 'That thou art', (Chā.6.8.7) intends to show that there is no difference between the jīva and the Brahman. Verily, can a lump of earth ever be said to be of gold? Similarly, notwithstanding the apparent distinction between the worshipper and the worshipped in points of their respective knowledge, power, karma, etc., Śruti deprecates

the view that there is distinction between them, by saying that 'One who sees any distinction moves from death to death, and that he does not know the truth at all' (Br. 4.4.19).

Of course there would be no difference between the view of the logicians and that of the Vedāntins, if by *jīva* is meant the reflected image of the Ātman in the upādhis of the senses, the mind and the intellect. But without making this clear if the logicians believe that the *jīva* is identical with the upādhis, then certainly, this is unacceptable to the Vedāntins. To them, unlike the *jīva*, God is the eternally pure consciousness (Caitanya), and ever free. Even the assemblages of gods, fathers and men as constituted by such *jīvas* are as perishable as the dust which is besmeared on the body. The Sun shines forever, and becomes unknowingly the instrumental cause of the activities of the people. But, forgetting this, people who are themselves bound by the upādhis, say about the Sun, that He rises and sets, and is the cause of day and night. Even so, the Īśvara or the Ātman is falsely called by the people as happy or miserable.

The opponent, however, takes a fresh opportunity to point out that the Ātman in everybody must be a different one, since it is found in experience that while one man is happy, another is miserable. And that is why, the Vaiśeṣikas have accepted 'Viśeṣa' as a distinct category. But this is wrong, since it involves the defect of reciprocal dependence. For, in order to establish the independent existence of things, they require Viśeṣa as a separate category; but the viśeṣa is dependent for its very existence on the things being separate and independent of each other. There is no reason why there should exist many ātmans corresponding to the many bodies, since the characteristics of the Ātman, such as Caitanya, all-pervasiveness, subtlety, etc., are always and equally present in the one Ātman. Negatively speaking, there are no exclusive characteristics of the so-called various ātmans, which should make them plural in number. A jar is different from a piece of cloth, because the characteristics of the one are exclusive from the other. Even during Mokṣa, if the Ātman be said, as endowed with an exclusive characteristic of its own, Mokṣa would certainly be perishable in nature. There is no change in the Ātman at any time and in any condition. To be permanently lodged in the unchangeable Ātman is the mokṣa, as we understand. What appears as distinct and separate in the various

jivātmans is not real, but is an illusion due to avidyā or the ignorance of the real Ātman. This occurs because when the jīva passes after death from one body to another, he forgets that he had the first body, and begins to take pride for having the new body. But in any case, it is on account of the upādhis that the jivātman, who is merely the reflection of the Ātman, is said to be bound. The same is said to be free when he thinks that his real nature is of the upādhiless Ātman. In other words, the reflection considered as reflection is bound, but it will be free if it is considered as having the same status as the original. 1

Once upon a time, while the gods and the demons were fighting a great battle, the Brahman who wished to protect the world, sided with the obedient gods and defeated the demons. With this success of the Brahman, the gods became prosperous and were greatly honoured. But they began to think that the success was due to their own greatness only. Knowing what was passing in their minds, the Brahman appeared before them with the view to removing their pride and grace them. But the gods were unable to understand what they were actually seeing before them, even though it was highly resplendent. 2

Then, though the gods were afraid they approached the divinity of Fire and said to him, 'As you are the most resplendent and omniscient amongst us, you alone deserve to know what this great, revered Being before us is'. The fire agreed to do so, and went running to the place where the great Being was; and when asked by the latter as to who he was, the Fire replied that he is known as jātaveda, the Fire. When he was asked further as to what power he possessed, the Fire replied that he could burn all that exists in this universe. The Brahman then placed a blade of grass before the Fire and said to him, 'Burn this, O Fire'. With all his might, the Fire tried his utmost to burn it, but could not. So, being ashamed and disappointed, he returned to the gods and admitted that he could not know who that great Being was (3-6). The gods then approached the Wind and requested him to know that great Being. The Wind too approached the Brahman with great speed, whereupon the Brahman asked him as to who he was. 'I am famous by the name of Mātariśvā, and I can take away anything in this world along with me by my power', replied the Wind. Then keeping a blade of grass before him, the Brahman asked him to carry it

away. With all his might the Wind tried his utmost to lift it, but he could not move it even a little. So, he too returned to gods with great shame and disappointment and told them that he was unable to know the Great Being. 7-10

The gods then approached Indra and requested him to ascertain who that great Being was. Indra went running fast, but the Brahman became unmanifest even while Indra was approaching him. But in that very region of the sky where the Brahman had become unmanifest, Indra saw a woman who was as beautiful as Haimavati Umā, wife of the Lord Rudra (Śankara). He came near her and asked her as to who that Being was.

Apparently, it looks strange that the Brahman should conceal himself from the sight of Indra, the wielder of the thunderbolt, when with the lesser divinities, namely, Agni and Vāyu, he should hold conversation also. The reason of this was that Indra being the Lord of all the gods, was puffed up with great pride; and it was essential that his pride must be totally removed before he could be graced by the Brahman. Indra, however, had one virtue which Agni and Vāyu did not possess. He was very inquisitive to know the great Being and so remained patiently in the very place from which the Brahman had disappeared. Therefore, the concealment of the Brahman from his sight was not a punishment to Indra, but a blessing in disguise. That is why there appeared before him a beautiful woman, who was none else but Vidyā, the Śakti of Brahman, who seems to have been pleased with Indra for his devotion to Brahman. 11-12

(Here ends the third Khaṇḍa of the Kenopaniṣad.)

KHAṆḌA FOUR

Umā told him that the great Being was none else but the Brahman. It was due to him that the gods became victorious and honoured, but that they became puffed up with pride. Indra came to know the Brahman only upon the instruction of Umā. In fact, all the three gods, Agni, Vāyu, and Indra, came very close to Brahman; they became all the more resplendent than other gods. But Indra is superior to both Agni and Vāyu, because being instructed by Umā, he came in direct contact with the

Brahman and therefore realized Him. 1-3

Therefore, the following should be considered as the advice regarding the upāsana as ordained by the Brahman and as communicated through Umā. Inasmuch as the Brahman appeared before the gods all of a sudden, as if he was the resplendent lightning which broke through intense darkness, one should know that Brahman is as shining as the lightning, and therefore contemplate upon it as such. But as the same Brahman became suddenly unmanifest even as Indra came very close to him, it is clear that Brahman is very difficult to be realized even by gods. Therefore, so far as the Adhidaivata (referring to gods) upāsana of Brahman is concerned, these two points should be remembered. As for the ādhyātmika upāsana of the Brahman which, as seen in the first khaṇḍa of this Upaniṣad, does not become the object of mind, but which being the Mind of mind becomes the source of the thinking power of the mind, one can say by courtesy that the mind appears as if to think about the Brahman. Besides, as Brahman is the Self of all, it can be said that mind is very close to it, and that it can as if make an approach to Brahman, because it is by the help of the mind that a wise man contemplates upon the Brahman. In other words, it is the Brahman who directs the man to remember the Brahman by the mind. So, what constitutes the Adhyatma-upāsana of the Brahman is to meditate mentally upon the meaning of the great statement, 'I am the Brahman.' One should also remember that as the Brahman is known by the name 'Vana', which means 'Bhajanīya' (worthy of being worshipped), the Ādhyātmika upāsana must be carried on with the resolve of worshipping the Brahman, even though he is not directly realized. Thus, so far is the twofold upāsana of Brahman or the Ātman which the spiritual teacher has imparted to his disciple, Whosoever will do this upāsana will be dear to all, and will be served by all. 4-7

Over and above, what the Brahmins, who wish to do the upāsana, should know is that it becomes firmly established in him who is endowed with the virtues of penance in the form of celibacy, control over the senses, and pious actions such as the performance of sacrifices. The four Vedas and the other branches of learning depending on the Vedas are also helpful in making the Brahma-vidyā firmly established in the upāsaka. As 'Brahma' is the name of the Vedas, and as Truth resides in the upāsaka,

it is quite natural that Brahma-vidyā should be deeply rooted in him. Naturally also, one who sticks firmly to this upāsanā, destroys all his sins, including dharma and adharma, and resides in that infinite heaven which is the abode of unmixed joy, and there results his union and identity with the Brahman. 8-9

(Here ends the fourth Khaṇḍa of the Kenopaniṣad as also the Upaniṣad.)

Retrospect

This is the Brāhmaṇopaniṣad of the Talavakāra branch of the Sāmaveda. It begins with the enquiry of an ardent disciple as to who must be that conscient Being under whose incentive the inconscient mind and the senses are found functioning properly. The teacher replied that he is the conscient Ātman or the Brahman realizing whom, after having given up their attachment to the body and the senses, as well as all their desires, the wise have become immortal. As the Ātman cannot be known by any of the senses, and as it transcends both the known and unknown aspects of the world, namely the effects and the causes, it must be realized in direct experience and in conformity with the experiences of the spiritual teacher and with those which are recorded in the scriptures. As such, no one shall be able to realize Ātman either by means of learning and reasoning or by the performance of sacrifice, penance and the giving of wealth in charity. As the Brahman has no specific quality and as it goes beyond the range of the mind and the senses, what the people in general worship can never be the worship of the Brahman, but that of the things which are not Brahman. Even after realizing the Brahman, if one were to think that he has known the Brahman, he would be falling away from the indivisible, non-dual experience of his own identity with Brahman. Therefore, those who think that Brahman is immanent in the body, mind, senses, and intellect, forget very often that it is transcendent also, and then being more confusedly aware of merely the upādhis of the body come to the conclusion that the upādhis themselves are the Brahman. No doubt, because of the immanence of the Brahman, the various sensuous experiences ought to have been occasions for reminding us that the Brahman within is concealed by the upādhis. But this does not generally happen; and what is external, superficial, and super-imposed is grasped by the senses and the intellect. Rare are the intelligent amongst men who having felt disgust (vairāgya) for the sensuous and the transitory affairs of the world, realize the Brahman and become immortal.

Having described the Brahma-vidyā and the fruit obtainable from it in the first two khaṇḍas of the Upaniṣad, there come for discussion in the third khaṇḍa certain philosophical problems such as the proofs for the existence of God, the power of Karma,

etc. Against his various opponents such as the Mīmāṃsakas, the logicians, the Lokāyatikas, the Bauddhas, and the Vaiśeṣikas Śaṅkarācārya proves that not only God exists, but that He is also the giver of the fruits of actions. The actions being inconscient require a doer; but there being innumerable doers there must be an infinite, impartial, truthful Witness also who will judge the merits and demerits of the several actions and mete out punishments and rewards accordingly. The doctrine of 'Apūrva' holds no water at all, since like Karma it is jaḍa and cannot be author of any judgement nor can distribute the fruits according to the merits of the actions of man. In short, for the purposeful planning and creation of this wonderful universe as also for the just distribution of the fruits of actions there is required an omniscient and omnipotent Being whom one may call as God.

The Upaniṣad then introduces an allegory to show the extraordinary power of Brahman by whose mere wish, the gods obtained a victory in their battle with the demons. The gods, however, thought, though wrongly, that it was by their own might that they were victorious. In order to remove their pride and to favour them, the Brahman appeared before them as a very resplendent Being. Agni and Wind approached to know Him, but as they proclaimed their own strength and power, they were respectively asked by the Brahman to burn and blow away a blade of grass which He placed before them. They tried their utmost but failed. Then as Indra approached, the Brahman disappeared. But Indra being inquisitive and patient, stood there with his wounded pride. Presently, there appeared a beautiful woman, who was none else but the Vidyā or the personified Caitanya of Brahman, by name Umā. Serving, as if, the purpose of the spiritual teacher, she told Indra that the great Being who had appeared before him and before Agni and Vāyu, was none else but Brahman, and that it was by His grace that the gods could have victory over the demons.

For realization of the Brahman, one can be much helped as the fourth khaṇḍa of the Upaniṣad tells us, if one cultivates the moral qualities such as control over the senses, celibacy, etc., and performs meritorious actions such as sacrifices, penances, and giving away of wealth in charity. Though, in fact, the Brahman remains ever uncontaminated and transcendent, there can yet be the Ādhidaivika and the Ādhyātmika upāsanā of

Him, by contemplating upon him, for instance, as the lustre of lightning or as the self of all, and by imagining constantly that one is Brahman.

etc. Against his various opponents such as the Mīmāṃsakas, the logicians, the Lokāyatikas, the Bauddhas, and the Vaiśeṣikas Śaṅkarācārya proves that not only God exists, but that He is also the giver of the fruits of actions. The actions being inconscient require a doer; but there being innumerable doers there must be an infinite, impartial, truthful Witness also who will judge the merits and demerits of the several actions and mete out punishments and rewards accordingly. The doctrine of 'Apūrva' holds no water at all, since like Karma it is jaḍa and cannot be author of any judgement nor can distribute the fruits according to the merits of the actions of man. In short, for the purposeful planning and creation of this wonderful universe as also for the just distribution of the fruits of actions there is required an omniscient and omnipotent Being whom one may call as God.

The Upaniṣad then introduces an allegory to show the extraordinary power of Brahman by whose mere wish, the gods obtained a victory in their battle with the demons. The gods, however, thought, though wrongly, that it was by their own might that they were victorious. In order to remove their pride and to favour them, the Brahman appeared before them as a very resplendent Being. Agni and Wind approached to know Him, but as they proclaimed their own strength and power, they were respectively asked by the Brahman to burn and blow away a blade of grass which He placed before them. They tried their utmost but failed. Then as Indra approached, the Brahman disappeared. But Indra being inquisitive and patient, stood there with his wounded pride. Presently, there appeared a beautiful woman, who was none else but the Vidyā or the personified Caitanya of Brahman, by name Umā. Serving, as if, the purpose of the spiritual teacher, she told Indra that the great Being who had appeared before him and before Agni and Vāyu, was none else but Brahman, and that it was by His grace that the gods could have victory over the demons.

For realization of the Brahman, one can be much helped as the fourth khaṇḍa of the Upaniṣad tells us, if one cultivates the moral qualities such as control over the senses, celibacy, etc., and performs meritorious actions such as sacrifices, penances, and giving away of wealth in charity. Though, in fact, the Brahman remains ever uncontaminated and transcendent, there can yet be the Ādhidaivika and the Ādhyātmika upāsanā of

Him, by contemplating upon him, for instance, as the lustre of lightning or as the self of all, and by imagining constantly that one is Brahman.

3

Kāthopaniṣad

Introduction

The Kāthopaniṣad has a unique characteristic of its own in that it gives a complete outline of the whole of the spiritual life from its beginning to its end by means of introducing an imaginary dialogue between Naciketas and Yama. The former represents the disciple and the latter, the spiritual Teacher. As Naciketas is shown to us as a lad of sixteen years only, the Upaniṣad suggests that the spiritual life should be resorted to even while one is young and that one should have clear understanding regarding the purpose of human life, and of various false notions which gather incidentally by way of tradition, custom, authority and so on regarding the performance of sacrifices and giving of wealth in charity. The Upaniṣad tells us that one should have the capacity to endure hardships as Naciketas had shown it when he was at the door of the Lord of Death. He stayed there for three days and nights without food and water. The disciple must have a further qualification of undaunted courage to decline even the most precious things of life, when the choice is between the pleasant and the highest Good. Naciketas chose the latter in the face of innumerable temptations which the Lord of Death placed before him. He wished to know the nature of the Ātman and the way to realize it, and so, the Lord of Death had no other option but to grant the same to him.

Preview

1. After being given away to Death by his angry father, Naciketas stays at the door of Yama for three days and nights without food and water.
2. Being advised by his minister, the Lord of death worships the Brahmin boy and bestows upon him three boons.
3. The first two boons Naciketas used in pacifying his father and in knowing the lore of the sacrificial fire and the sacrifice.
4. By the third boon he wished to know the nature of the Ātman.
5. Yama tried his best to entice the boy by offering him all the pleasures of wealth, power, glory and of the beautiful damsels in the heaven; but Naciketas remained unmoved.
6. To realize the immortal Ātman and to become one with Him is to see his immaculate form as growing and as covering everything else, and as being the cause and source of all.
7. One who realizes the Ātman thus becomes himself visible in far off places.
8. None but the person whom the Ātman wishes to favour will realize the Ātman. Neither learning, nor sermons will be of any avail.
9. The very office of the Lord of Death and all the meritorious actions which were instrumental in securing it are perishable.
10. Subtler than the senses are the objects, namely, sound touch, form, flavour and smell; subtler still are in succession, mind, intellect, will (Mahat) and the unmanifest Prakṛti.
11. The transcendental Puruṣa or the Brahman is the subtlest of all in whom everything else must be ultimately resolved.
12. Get up therefore from sloth and sleep, approach a great saint and get yourself initiated in the lore of the Ātman.
13. For, sharp as the razor, narrow and difficult is the path of the spirit.
14. Rare is the person who withdraws his attention from the outside objects and desires, and unlike the gods, attains to the absolute immortality and bliss.

15. He sees the Ātman before he sees the external world.
16. The mystic produces the sacrificial fire within himself by rubbing against each other the ingoing and outgoing breaths, and throws into it the oblations of his desires.
17. He sees the Brahman in the form of his own person, which fills his heart, his whole body and the whole of the outside world.
18. On the contrary, one who sees difference moves from death to death.
19. Transforming the devotee in its own nature, the Brahman assumes the embodied form of the devotee and yet remains transcendent and uncontaminated.
20. Excepting the root of the tree of worldly existence, the whole of the tree is short-lived, illusory, changing and as good as non-existing.
21. Existing, it does not exist for one who has realized the Brahman.
22. Even this phenomenal world comes out of Brahman, and is sustained and dissolved in it.
23. Should not man fear the Brahman, if due to his fear the fire burns, the Sun shines, Indra rules over gods, and Death does his duty ?
24. Realization of the Brahman, or the seeing of one's own form, as if in a mirror, will surely and very easily take place in the assembly of the saints, and before the fall of the body.
25. The prāṇas of the realized person do not depart, but they become only merged in his body at the time of death.
26. Instead of being satisfied with the vision of the Ātman as the immanent, inner Self, one ought to extract from his body, as one would extract a blade of grass from its sheath, and see him again before him as the transcendent, lustrous, immortal BEING, namely the Brahman.

ADHYĀYA FIRST: VALLI (SECTION) FIRST

Naciketas was yet a boy, not even sixteen years old, when his father, Vājaśravas, performed a sacrifice, known as 'Viśvajit', in which, according to the rules of the sacrifice, he gave up in charity all he possessed, though himself he was wishing to obtain the fruits of that sacrifice. When the lad saw that his father gave away in charity even such cows which were too weak to eat even a morsel of grass and which were too old to bear any offspring and incapable of holding milk in their udders, he became sad with the thought that instead of getting the desired and the good fruits of the sacrifice, his father would only go to dwell in the worlds which are full of misery and ignorance. With the view therefore to doing good to his father and to warding off the evil consequences of his wrongful charity, Naciketas thought that he should even lay down his life and save his father. So, approaching his father with humility, he asked him, 'To what priest would you like to give me away in charity?' Twice did the father remain silent; but when the son asked him the same question a third time, he became enraged by the audacity of his son and said that he would give him up to Death. 1-4

At this, Naciketas thought to himself, "Inasmuch as in spite of my being the best among the disciples and sons, if my father had made up his mind to deliver me in the hands of death, it must have been out of anger only." Yet, he wished that his father should not change his mind and go away from the path of truth by being overcome by the natural parental affection. So, approaching him again, he said to his repentant and mournful father, "Sir, do follow in the footsteps of your forefathers, and see how the saints of the present time also behave. None of them has made himself a liar by going back upon his words. And, what would a liar gain in this mortal world? He will not be able to stop thereby his rounds of births and deaths. So, please do as you have said and send me unto Yama, the god of Death". 5-6

Upon this Vājaśravas sent his son to the abode of the Lord of Death; but as the latter had gone out and did not return for three days, Naciketas remained at the gates for three nights without any food to eat. After his return, Yama was told by

his minister how the Brāhmaṇa boy who had come at his doors as a guest had to fast for three days, and how therefore as a result of this, all the desires of the host, along with the good effects of the sacrifices which he might have performed or of the philanthropic acts of providing gardens and wells for the travellers, as also his sons and cattle would be completely destroyed. The minister advised Yama to treat the Brāhmaṇa who comes to his house as a guest as none else than Fire, and that he should therefore appease him by washing his feet with water, and by serving him in other ways. Yama did as he was advised; and after worshipping Naciketas, prayed to him to bless him as also to accept three boons from him and demand anything he would like in exchange for them, since he had to go without food for three successive nights. 7-9

'Yes, if you are pleased with me', said Naciketas, 'then grant me, O Yama, in exchange for my first boon that my father should recognize me as one who has come back safe from the abode of Death, and with his anger being calmed down, and there being no anxious thought about me in his mind, he should talk with me in delight.' Forthwith, said Yama, 'Let it be accomplished exactly as you wish. Your father, known as he is also by the names of Uddālaka and Ārūṇi, has already seen you as freed from the jaws of death, and so will meet and talk with you with love.' 10-11

Then, regarding the second boon Naciketas said, 'Teach me, O Lord of Death, that lore of the fire which you know as being able to lead a man to heaven. For, it is in the heaven, as I hear, that men who go there after death attain to the immortal nature of gods. They have then neither any fear of disease and old age, nor of you. Neither do they suffer from hunger and thirst, nor from mental afflictions' (12-13). Whereupon, with great pleasure Yama described to him entire process and significance of preparing the sacrificial pit by means of a particular number of bricks, and of propitiating the first born principle of Fire which is self-lustrous, knowledge incarnate, and the support of the world, but which resides in the hearts of those whose faculty of intuition has been awakened. One who worships this Fire thrice in a day, and at the same time is tutored by his mother, father, and teacher, and one who follows the instructions of the Vedas, the Smṛtis and of the saintly persons, and reconciles his

perceptual knowledge with that arrived at by means of inference and trustworthy authority, is alone capable of combining his actions like sacrifice and charity with his knowledge. Such a person alone can go beyond the rounds of birth and death, and attain the perfect peace known as Vairāja. Being highly pleased with Naciketas, the Lord of Death delivered upto him, by way of an additional fourth boon, a multiform garland of words, meaning thereby, the 'mantra' for meditating upon, and assured him that the Fire itself would be known thenceforth by the name 'Nāciketa Agni', and that one who worships the same would attain the delights of heaven. Yama then asked him to choose whatever he wanted for his third boon. 14-19

(So far, the story is narrated to the extent to which man is concerned only with the knowledge of the empirically perceivable world, with his activities and experiences of the pleasant or the unpleasant fruits thereof, whether in this world or in the heaven, and with the means, the injunctions and the prohibitions connected with them. All this however is irrelevant from the viewpoint of one who wishes to have the knowledge of the Ātman which alone will put an end to the root-cause of this transitory and miserable worldly life, namely, the ignorance about the eternally Real. With this end in view, the Upaniṣad now turns to the third boon of Naciketas.)

Naciketas said, 'So far as my third boon is concerned, I wish to know if after the death of a man there still remains or does not remain the Ātman, who they say, is different from the body, mind, senses, and intellect. For, there is neither any direct nor indirect proof about this'. 20

(Before, however, imparting the knowledge of the Ātman, the Lord of Death wished to test the boy and see whether he was fit to receive it.)

'Do not embarrass me', said Yama, 'by insisting upon me to explain to you the nature of the Ātman; for, when the gods also find that the knowledge of it is too subtle to be understood by them, it is almost impossible for ordinary men to comprehend it. Please therefore, O Naciketas, demand anything else from me. You may ask to be endowed with sons and grandsons who would live long for one hundred years, or ask for wealth including gold and jewels, and cattle, and horses and elephants, or a very large portion of the earth for you to rule upon, as also a

span of life of whatever length you wish, and a perfectly healthy body with senses able to enjoy this all. Whatever is impossible to be had in this mortal world, even the beautiful damsels of the heavens for your service, and chariots and musical instruments, you can demand from me. But do not ask me regarding the condition of the soul after death.' 21, 23-25

Without being tempted in the least by the alluring words of Yama, Naciketas said, 'O Lord, let these things such as chariots, dances of beautiful, heavenly damsels, and music be with you only. I do not at all wish to have them. One does not know whether they are going to last even till tomorrow. And by enjoying them man will only lose the power of his senses, and will then be deprived of all the good things of his life, such as valour, understanding, lustre, and fame. And what after all is a long life except in name? Even the longest life of Brahmadeva will surely come to an end. I know I shall get both wealth and a long life if I wish to have them, for the simple reason that I have been able to see you. But no amount of wealth will make a man satisfied; and my long life too will last till you hold the office of the Lord of Death. Who but an unfortunate man knowing himself to be subject to the miseries of old age and death, would approach the gods and request them to grant him the perishable things such as wealth, progeny, and the company of the heavenly damsels? I therefore do not want anything else except the boon I have requested you to grant. And, besides, O Lord, there is none else than you who is competent to explain the secret of the knowledge of the Ātman.' 22, 26-29

ADHYĀYA FIRST: VALLI SECOND

After having tested Naciketas and found him fit to receive the knowledge of the Ātman, the Lord of Death said: There are two motives, the pleasant and the Good, which make a man go by the path of either ignorance (avidyā) or by the path of knowledge (Vidyā). They are quite opposed to each other as light and darkness are; and yet they are presented before man as mixed together. As both of them cannot be pursued simultaneously for a long time, the wise among men make a careful analysis and comparison of the nature and the consequences of

the two, and choose the Good and leave the pleasant, just as the swan is said to be able to separate and drink the milk and leave the water which is mixed with it. The fools, on the other hand, choose what is pleasant only, because that helps them to look with interest to their livelihood, to their bodily comforts, and to all other pleasing objects, such as wealth, progeny and cattle. Though they are enveloped in the thick darkness of ignorance, they consider themselves to be very wise; but like the blind led by other blind men, they all are carried away by their various and thoughtless desires into the regions of disease, old age and death. How can such persons, who are excessively attached to women and wealth, think at all about immortality and the means to attain it? They are bound to come again and again in my clutches. 1-6

He who has the knowledge of the Ātman is however, one among thousands. In fact, rare is the person who hears something about the Ātman. Rarer is the person who hears about the Ātman and understands what he hears. Rarer still is one who hears and understands about Him and keeps one's mind purified. And then, if anyone is found to speak about the Ātman, he must really be considered as a great wonder. For, he would be the rarest of all who, after being instructed by another realized soul, realizes the Ātman for himself also. 7

No ordinary person, howsoever he may think about the Ātman with all his skill about reasoning and argumentation, can be able to describe him in the least. How can the human intellect, which is totally unconcerned with the ardent longing which you, O Naciketas, have got in order to realize the truth, and which is equally unconcerned with the faculty of God-realization which is being awakened in you by me, be able to probe into the nature of the Ātman who is subtler than the subtlest? In fact, the various ramifications, which the mind and the reasoning are capable of creating, come to an end the moment the Ātman is realized. There remains nothing beyond the Ātman, and as such nothing else to be known, nor any other status or destination to which one has to rise or go. Being unlike the sensible objects, that is, being inaccessible to the senses, and being hidden as it were by innumerable desires and miseries of the world, the eternal Ātman is too difficult to be perceived except by the intuitive kind of understanding which would enable one to

withdraw one's mind from the sensible objects and go beyond both joy and grief to the bliss of the Ātman only. I therefore admire your courage and love for the truth, O Naciketas, in that you have forsaken all the enjoyable objects of this world and of the heaven for the single purpose of attaining the highest Good, namely, the realization of the Ātman. How indeed I wish I should have a son like you! Look to myself, on the other hand, who in spite of having known that which no amount of perishable means can win for us, namely, the imperishable divine bliss of the Ātman, I only sought a relatively permanent office of the Lord of Death, by propitiating the Nāciketa-Agni and by the offerings of perishable things only. But for you, O Naciketas, the doors of Mokṣa have become open. 8-13

Being encouraged by the words of Yama, Naciketas said, 'If you are pleased with me, O Lord, then do tell me all about the Ātman whom you are directly perceiving, and who is beyond the law of causation, and beyond all that has happened in the past or would happen in the future.' 'Well, I shall describe for you,' said Yama, 'the nature of that highest goal which is described by all the Vedas, which is sought to be realized by means of penances, and to attain which the aspirants dwell in the residence of their spiritual teacher with a view to serving him and do as he bids. That final destiny is the syllable Om; it is the Brahman which is at once both saṁguṇa (with attributes) and nirguṇa (without attributes); and it is at the same time the Name or the symbol of it which can be uttered and meditated upon in order to achieve whatever one wishes to have or to realize the Brahman itself. Naturally, Om is the best and the highest of all the means that might be available for the worship and the realization of the Ātman as being identical with Brahman. Therefore, it is said that the Ātman has neither any birth nor any death; nor is he the product of some other things as being prior to him; he is eternally the same primordial Being who is incapable of being killed even though the body is killed. As there is nothing else besides the Ātman, it cannot also be said that he kills anyone else; and so one who thinks that one is being killed and one who thinks that one is the killer, are both ignorant. 14-19

The aspirant, on the other hand, strives to purify his mind and the senses by banishing all sorts of worldly desires;

and then when he becomes calm and composed, he becomes the witness of the glory and the majesty of the Ātman who, though hidden in the bodies of all the creatures, is seen as growing in its Form so as to cover all that exists from the minutest to the highest. And when the mystic realizes the Ātman in this manner, that is, when he himself becomes the all-pervading Ātman, will it be too much to say that, though bodily and externally considered he might be sitting or lying down in one place, he might be seen in his immaculate form as even walking in a far-off place? In fact, it is the mystic who alone can experience this condition of bliss which transcends both happiness and misery. Like the bodiless Ātman, the mystic too becomes bereft of the consciousness that he is limited by body, senses, mind and egoism; and being himself as large and as immortal as the Ātman, he goes beyond grief. 20-22

None can ever realize the Ātman by being very learned, or by the mere repetition of the Vedic texts, or by merely listening to the preaching of sermons. He will be realized only by that person whom the Ātman wishes to favour, and to whom he reveals himself. Nor will the Ātman be realized by him who has not left the ways of sinful behaviour, who goes by the way as directed by his wayward senses, and whose mind is not at all composed on account of his various desires, though such a one might possess abundant, verbal knowledge about the Brahman or the Ātman. Who indeed can know Him as he is in his own true nature, if, so far as his power of destruction is concerned, he devours both the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas, who are respectively supposed to be the custodians of Dharma and the protectors of beings, as a mere rice-plate at his dining table, and for whose dinner even the God of death serves the purpose of a spicy soup which can be tastefully mixed with the rice? 23-25.

ADHYĀYA FIRST: VALLI THIRD

(During the course of the first few verses of the second valli of this adhyāya, Yama had referred to the two ways of living, namely, of the Vidyā and the Avidyā; that is, of one leading to the knowledge of God, and of the other leading to the rounds of birth and death. But then, a full discussion of these two

ways of living and of the consequences of the two was not done. So, what is sought to be done in this third valli is a further discussion of the fate and the destiny to which the ignorant and the wise are led, on account of their possessing avidyā and Vidyā respectively. For the sake of achieving this purpose it is conveniently imagined that there are two ātmans which reside in the same body. In fact, they are only two modes of living of one and the same individual soul.)

Yama proceeds to explain in the manner of the knowers of the Brahman, as also of those who know the Pañcāgni-vidyā or worship the Nāciketa-agni thrice a day, that there are two ātmans who have entered in this cave of the body and have taken shelter in the intellect of man, so that the Brahman might reveal to him in his heart only. Both of them are opposed in nature, like light and darkness; but both have necessarily to experience the fruits of their actions, which are considered as good from their respective view-points.

That the sinful can never attain the knowledge of the Brahman was already told in verse 24 of the second valli. What Yama wishes to point out here is that even the so-called meritorious actions of those who perform various sacrifices cannot enable them to realize the Ātman. At the most, they will lead them to heaven, which after all is the region of the un-ātman. We should note in this connection how Yama did not hesitate to confide to Naciketas that the very office of the Lord of Death which was bestowed upon him as the fruit of his meritorious activity, namely, the worshipping of the Nāciketa-agni (1, 2, 10), as also the means of attaining it were both perishable, and as such, incapable of leading him to the realization of the Ātman. Actions which are good in the sense of being non-sinful, that is, such actions as penance, sacrifice, and charity are no doubt socially useful and morally commendable, and that they may point out the path which leads to the 'spiritual good', namely the realization of the Ātman. But, in any case, they will never be the substitute for the exclusively spiritual means of devotional meditation on the Ātman. It should further be noted that even the young boy, Naciketas, knew well that the incumbent of office of the Lord of Death was a shortlived one.

As I know, says Yama, the lore of the Nāciketa-agni which serves as a bridge to reach the Brahman for those who are en-

gaged in sacrificial activities, and as I also know the imperishable, highest Brahman which is beyond all fear and to which therefore people might wish to reach by crossing the ocean of misery, I wish you to know, O Naciketas, that this body is like a chariot, the Ātman is the owner of the chariot, the intellect is the charioteer, the mind is the reins, the sense-organs are the horses yoked to the chariot, and the objects of the senses are the very road by which the horses are to run. Yet, those who have the correct understanding tell us that this very Ātman is spoken of as the individual soul (jīva) when he is limited by body, mind, senses, and intellect, and that it is he who is bound to experience the fruits of his actions. If, however, the understanding of a man is vitiated by the loss of control over his mind, his senses too run helter-skelter, just as the horses let loose from the reins of the charioteer go anywhere they like. It is very necessary therefore to be alert and to control the mind and the senses, and so to purify them as will enable him to bypass the way of the worldly life and to attain the highest state of the all-pervading Brahman, from which there would be no return. For, in comparison with the gross nature of the sense-organs (which have necessarily a physical structure), the objects apprehended by the senses (namely, sound, touch, form, flavour, and smell) are very subtle; but subtler than the objects is the mind; subtler than the mind is the intellect; subtler still is the cosmic intellect and will, known as the Hiraṇyagarbha or the Mahān Ātman; subtler than this is the Avyakta, that is, the invisible, original seed of all creation known as Prakṛti; and the subtlest of all is the transcendent Puruṣa, beyond whom there is nothing else, and approaching whom none returns. 2-11

Yet, how wonderful are the powers of avidyā and Māyā that notwithstanding his being the innermost reality of all the beings in the universe and the cause of all sensible knowledge, He does not reveal his true nature, but keeps himself hidden as it were by the products of Prakṛti! And as a result of this, man who is in reality nothing but the Ātman, does not realize the truth of this, even though he is instructed to believe it again and again. On the contrary, without being told by anyone, he believes that he is the body, mind, and senses, even though he sees that these are no better than the material parts of the world as pots and jars are. All this however need not preclude the possibility of

the Ātman being seen by persons who, on account of their moral and spiritual discipline, have cultivated the power of perceiving the subtler entities as noted above. Therefore, one who wishes to realize the Ātman should first dissolve the activities of one's senses in their subtle source, namely, the mind; one should then dissolve the vacillating tendencies of one's mind in that which is subtler than the mind and which remains steady and firm, namely, one's understanding; this again, one must dissolve in the cosmic will and reason, by resigning oneself to that very subtle but controlling, original source of all cognition and conation; and finally, this too must be resolved in the one, supreme, undifferentiated Ātman. On reaching this highest stage, one will necessarily discover that the entire world, consisting of names, forms, activities, desires, and their means and fruits, is automatically resolved into the one Ātman, just as the knowledge of the rope resolves the snake which was appearing on the rope itself. The snake disappears, and the rope only remains; even so, the world disappears, the Brahman alone remains. 12-13

Therefore, O ye men, who have been fast sleeping under the all-ruinous influence of the ignorance of the Ātman, get up immediately, and keeping yourself full awake, approach with humility the great saints and get yourselves initiated into the lore of the Ātman. Do not neglect to do so. For, in the first place, you have to train your understanding in such a way as will enable you to know the subtlest Reality. And, second, the path of the spirit, as told by those who have gone before, is as narrow and difficult to tread upon as the sharp edge of a razor. It is only after the realization of the Ātman that it can be said about a person that he has made himself free from the jaws of death. And, one can be said to have realized the Ātman if, in the first place, one experiences Him as imperishable, that is, as devoid of the perishable qualities of objects, namely, sound, touch, form, flavour and smell. Second, the Ātman has to be realized as eternal, that is, as being uncaused by anything prior to him in which he might possibly be dissolved; for, he himself is the uncaused cause of all. Third, the experience of the Ātman will make one understand that there is no end to his existence, and that nothing can come into existence which is other than the Ātman. And, being always of the nature of self-consciousness the Ātman is in

need of the instrument of reason which is required for men to make them aware of the perceptible and inferable world of objects. and so, the Ātman has to be experienced as the immovable witness and the inner Self of all that exists. Then alone can incalculable benefit be bestowed upon others who are eager to receive this lore of the Ātman. One who sings it, or one who explains it with a pure heart in an assembly of the Brāhmaṇas, that is, of those who have either realized the Brahman or are on the path of realizing it, becomes himself glorified and fit to be worshipped by others. 14-17

ADHYĀYA SECOND: VALLI FIRST

(If the Ātman, as described above, cannot be seen except by the means of one-pointed concentration of the mind and intellect, one might ask as to what it is which prevents one to do so, and what should the remedy be to remove that obstacle. In order to meet this question, the Lord of Death says:)

Men do not generally think of looking at the inner Ātman, because their sense-organs are so constructed by God that they have a natural tendency only to perceive the outside world of objects and become aware of sound, touch, form, flavour, and smell. Rare, however, is a courageous person who with a view to having a taste of the immortal life, withdraws his attention from the outside objects, and turning his gaze within himself, becomes able to visualize the Ātman. There is another reason why people in general look outside only. They do so in order to satisfy their various desires, such as the possession of wealth, progeny, etc. Naturally, they get themselves always engaged in various activities, and then being entangled again and again by desires, actions and their fruits, get themselves entrapped in the rounds of birth and death, and become subject to various calamities, miseries, diseases, and old age. The wise, on the contrary, have their eye, not on the relative immortality of the gods in the heaven, but on the only one absolute immortality of the Ātman which is independent of any activity, and so they become able to shut out all desires and to swim against the current of the worldly existence right up to its source, namely, the Ātman. For, it is due to the Ātman alone that one can have the know-

ledge of the outside world, including the body and the senses, though the ordinary, ignorant people think that this is possible on account of our senses. If indeed the body and the senses which are as objective as sound, touch, form, etc., were alone capable of knowing the objects of the world and of feeling the pleasures and pains without the presence of the Ātman, the sounds, the touches, etc., would have also known each other even without the senses and mind. The Ātman alone is the all-knower, and so, there would be nothing which the Ātman will not come to know. Therefore, this Ātman or Brahman alone, about whom Naciketas wished to know is the only Reality which will remove all grief, and which the wise come to realize as being identical with their self, and through which they come to know all that happens in dreams and in the waking life. 1-4

Why should then the person, who sees the Ātman as being very close to him, and who comes to realize that his so-called soul which tastes the fruits of his actions is none else but the Ātman, none else but the controller of all the events at all times and the support of life, care at all to protect his own tiny individuality? If there is nothing else but the Ātman, what is to be protected and from whom? He sees within himself the vision of this very Ātman as the Hiraṇyagarbha, that is, the golden coloured form of the highest Brahman even before he sees the physical elements such as earth, water, and other objects of the world. Even the presence of the vital energy due to which the soul experiences sound, touch, form, flavour, and smell, becomes known to him within himself as a form of the Brahman. Nay, he knows through direct experience that the sacrificial fire which is produced by rubbing two pieces of wood is just the fire which is produced within himself, by meditating day after day upon the Brahman along with the ingoing and the outgoing breaths. Like a pregnant woman who nourishes the embryo, or like the person who is careful to preserve the sacrificial fire by throwing oblations in it, the Brahmayogin also is ever awake to preserve the fire of the knowledge of Brahman in him by meditating upon it constantly. It is this vital breath (prāṇa) therefore in which the meditation on the Brahman is practised, which constitutes the hub of the wheel as if, in which the spokes are fixed. In other words, this kind of breath or prāṇa is the Brahman from whom manifest the various deities of the senses,

fire and the sun, and in whom they all go for rest. Therefore, the soul of the individual person who possesses this kind of prāṇa, informed as it is with the Brahman, cannot be considered as different from the Brahman. What is there is here, and what is here is there. One who sees difference in the jīva and the Brahman wanders from death to death. It is advisable therefore that before the actual realization of the identity of the soul with the Brahman, one should have a clear intellectual understanding with the help of scriptures and of the spiritual teacher that the Brahman is one and not many. 5-11

The yogin sees the Brahman in the form of his own person within his heart which is in the mid-portion of his body. But as the space of the heart is of the size of a thumb, the Puruṣa which manifests therein is said to be of that dimension, though paradoxically as if he fills the whole of the body and the universe outside. The Brahman makes his appearance as a brilliant, smokeless flame of light; and being the immovable, eternal controller of all that has happened in the past and that would happen in the future, will remain the same, whether it is today or tomorrow. Knowing this the yogin does not care about what might happen to his body. For, one who cares for the body only, thinking that one is different from the Brahman, will have to be born again and again as an embodied creature, and will be drifted far away and away from the bliss of Brahman, just as the rain-water falling from a high precipice will be scattered away and dried up without forming any continuous stream. One should therefore, O Gautama, realize the Ātman so that he would thereby realize that one is the same as the one, homogeneous and blissful Brahman, just as pure water mixed with pure water will together be the one homogeneous mass of pure water only. 12-15

ADHYĀYA SECOND: VALLI SECOND

(To realize the Brahman is the most difficult pursuit of all; but as the narration about its nature is of the utmost value for the upliftment of the aspiring soul, it is being done in a different manner in this valli.)

The human body is the city wherein dwells the king of that

city, namely, the Ātman who can never be amenable to any change, who, being bereft of birth and death, always remains uncontaminated, and as equal to all like the Sun. This city has eleven gates, eight of which are located in the portion from the throat upwards. They are the mouth, the two nostrils, the two ears, the two eyes and the one known as the Brahma-randhra, located at the top of the skull though it appears as closed. The other three gates are the navel, the generating organ, and the anus. The door-keepers or the presiding deities that are appointed at these gates, all pay their homage to the king by being busy at his bidding to work for him and to please him. Unlike them, however, the soul can please him, if only he leaves away all his desires regarding wealth, progeny, etc., and if, even after realizing him, meditates and contemplates upon him. Thus only can a man go beyond grief and fear even while he is living. 1

As for the Ātman, he does not dwell in each one of the several bodies in such a way as to suggest that there are as many ātmans as there are bodies. Notwithstanding the bodies being many, there is only one universal Ātman who is all-pervading and immanent in all. He is known as Haṁsa, because he moves everywhere like the wind and the Sun; known as Vasu, because he is all-pervading; he is both the place and the fire of sacrifice; he comes there as a guest in the form of the Soma juice, or as a Brāhmaṇa; he visits the worlds of gods and men; he is the truth as well as the sacrifice; he moves in the heavens; he assumes the forms of shells, conches, and crocodiles when he moves in water; rice and barley which grow in the fields are he; and so are the rivers and the rivulets that come down from the mountains. Because he grows in this manner and because he is the cause of all, he is also known as 'Bṛhat' (from the Sanskrit root 'Bṛh' to grow). And, thus it is that he is at once one and all-pervading. 2

Though the beautiful Ātman resides in the heart, he illumines the understanding of man so that he may worship him, just as at the command of the Ātman, the senses, as said above, are busy in doing their functions of seeing, hearing, etc., and his breaths are pushed upwards and downwards from the region of the heart. In fact, the man lives not because of the prāṇas or the ingoing and the outgoing breaths, as is ordinarily believed, but by the presence of the Ātman on whom are dependent not

only the vital breaths but also all the senses, mind and intellect for their very existence. That is why the moment the Ātman departs from the body, all the assemblage of the prāṇas and the senses also leave the body. The Ātman alone is the independent principle of consciousness and of life; while all the others which are inert, inconscient, and lifeless in themselves owe their activity to the Ātman only. Either realize this Ātman as Naciketas wished to do, and get yourself completely detached from this worldly existence, or wander from death to death and be searching forever for fresh and suitable bodies of creatures, or even of plants and inanimate objects like stones to get yourself embodied and taste the good or bad fruits of your actions. 3-7

Know this Ātman as being ever awake even while the Prāṇas and the senses go to sleep, and as producing in the mind of the sleeper various objects which the latter wishes to enjoy. Know him, however, as the pure, imperishable Brahman which is the source and the support of all, and whose command none can transgress. Noteworthy indeed are the uncommon characteristics of this Ātman who works out a twofold identity between himself and the Brahman as well as with the whole of the phenomenal world. Just as fire transforms the wood into fire, and assumes itself the shape of the burnt wood, even so the invisible Ātman, who is the inner Self of all, becomes manifest and transforms the devotee into a prototype of himself and assumes for himself the personality and the embodied nature of the devotee, and yet, remains as the only transcendent Reality of all. Or, like the one wind which functions differently as prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, etc., the Ātman behaves differently in different persons. But one need not suppose that, being the inner self of all, the Ātman might be sharing the joys and sorrows of others. For, it is his transcendent nature which keeps him uncontaminated by them, just as the Sun who is the source of the sight of all the creatures is not contaminated by the defects in their eyes, or by the dirty things on which he throws his rays. In short, the Ātman is not at all affected by what appears on the Ātman, just as the rope is not affected by the serpent which appears on the rope. 8-11

Whosoever then has the intuitive vision of the Ātman, who is the only supportless supporter, the controller and the inner Self of all he creates, and whosoever courageously gazes at the Ātman becomes the possessor of an imperishable joy which is denied to

others. Realizing that it is the Ātman alone who is the imperishable among the perishables, the very consciousness of the conscious beings, and the fulfiller of the desires of the people, who-soever would gaze at him would obtain eternal peace. Verily, none should have any misgiving whether the unique and the highest bliss, which is vouchsafed by those who have realized it by being thoroughly desireless, can be had or not. For, the Ātman would not only show an occasional glimpse of himself, but would also shine in his full splendour. It is said on this account that neither the Sun and the moon, nor the stars, nor the lighting and the fire can ever be able to show by their light as to what kind of light the Brahman might manifest. All of them shine by the borrowed light of the Brahman, and are known to possess it only when the Brahman manifests as light. 12-15

ADHYĀYA SECOND: VALLI THIRD

(The sermon in this third and the final valli is intended to carry conviction to the mind of Naciketas that the Brahman alone is the root of the tree of this vast existence.)

Wonderful is this tree of worldly existence which has its root upwards in the form of Brahman, and which, though it might not last even till the dawn of tomorrow and is therefore known as the 'A-śva-ttha, ('not-tomorrow-lasting', and which also means the Pippala tree), is considered paradoxically as if that it has neither any beginning nor any end. That root being verily the Brahman, is pure, self-luminous and imperishable, it is the support and the sustenance of all the worlds. None can ever transgress its command.

But excepting the root, so far as the rest of the tree is concerned, it is as shortlived, illusory, changing, as an object in a dream, or as the snake on a rope, or as water in a mirage is. It grows out of the seed of desires, and being watered by good or bad actions, yields unto men pleasant or unpleasant fruits. It grows in the same manner endlessly again and again, and it ends also in the same manner through disease, old-age, and death. With the realization of Brahman, however, it withers and dies away into nothingness. Existing though, it does not exist for one who has realized the Brahman. This, however, does not mean

that the existence of the phenomenal world comes out of nothing. For, it comes out of Brahman, in it it is sustained, and in Brahman again it is dissolved. It is due to the fear of the Brahman who is verily the raised thunderbolt that all the activities in the universe are going on smoothly, and without there being any exception or delay of even a single minute. It is through the fear of the Brahman that fire burns, the Sun shines, Indra rules over the gods, and wind and the Lord of Death are in great haste to perform their respective duties. 1-3

If such is the case, should not men fear the Brahman and achieve the supreme end of life, namely, the realization of Brahman even before the fall of body? Otherwise, it is certain that after death, one would be born again as an embodied creature. As for the criterion whether one has realized the Brahman or not, it is worth noting that it is by means of the intuitive faculty of God-realization that one can have a very clear and distinct vision of one's own immaculate self, just as one can see one's own face clearly and distinctly in a mirror. This, however, will easily happen in the Brahmaloka, that is in the assembly of the saints who have realized the Brahman, and not in the world of the departed souls, known as the world of manes, or in the world of the heavenly bards known as the Gandharvas. For, in such worlds, the vision will be indistinct and blurred, as if it is an object in a dream or a reflection in water. Then, with the clear vision of the Ātman, there will also arise the knowledge that the senses which have come into being out of the different elements, such as earth, water, fire, etc., and which possess the capacity of cognizing specific objects such as smell, flavour, form, etc., in the waking life, are all non-different from the Ātman, who is the transcendent cause of both the senses and the elements, and who, being the inner self of all, is constantly awake. He is, as already told in 1,3,10-11, the subtlest and the most transcendent of all. No doubt, mind is subtler than the senses; subtler than the mind is the intellect; subtler still is the Mahat or the cosmic intelligence; and subtler than mahat is the original seed of all the creation known as Avyakta. One, however, who realizes the subtlest Reality of all, namely, the Puruṣa or the Ātman, who transcends even the Avyakta, is released even while one is alive. He becomes immortal and goes beyond all grief. His body, senses, mind, and intellect can

no longer be the indicators of what he would then become, and so can no longer bind him also. 4-9

Why should not then one close his senses, stop the functions of one's mind and intellect and remain steadfast in the supra-sensuous, supramental, and supra-intellectual condition of the ever conscious Ātman? Let him form this habit of remaining close to the Ātman, so that he will gradually and automatically be able, as told in 1,3,13 and 2,2,1 to withdraw the attention, the energy, and the activities of his senses, mind, and intellect from the external and the internal objects of desires and direct them towards the Ātman only. What will happen by this practice of the suspension of the outgoing energy and the activities of the senses, etc., which we may call as the Ātmayoga or the Brahmayoga, is the opening of the subtle, supra-intellectual insight known as the intuitive eye, referred to above, and the end of the chain of miseries, disease, old-age, and the rounds of birth and death. Then will no one say that Brahman does not exist; for, he would know by his moral and devotional practice that he himself has an existence which is independent of and beyond the limitations of his senses, mind, and intellect, and that there must exist a supreme, conscious Being as both the material and the efficient cause of this universe, just as there are the potter and the clay as the efficient and the material causes of the vessels and jars. After knowing further that God is as immanent in him as in the world, the yogin would also come to know in due course that just as clay which, though immanent in the vessels and jars, is alone real, and not the names and forms of the jars that appear on the clay, even so God is different from his creation and so not only immanent but also transcendent. In short, it is to him who starts with the conviction that God exists, and who undergoes the yogic practice, that God reveals himself both as the immanent and the transcendent Reality of all. 10-13

And the moment all the knots of desires which had taken resort in the senses, mind, and the intellect of the yogin are cut asunder, he becomes the immortal Brahman even while he is living, and realizes that the Ātman he had seen within him is nothing else but Brahman. To what other region then can he go after death? As the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad says, his prāṇas do not depart; they become only merged in his body at

the time of death (4,4,6). But, in the case of those others, who instead of resorting to this lore of the Brahman, worship the lower deities such as the fire of the Nāciketa sacrifice, the sojourn of the soul to some other region after death is no doubt a fact. Out of the one hundred and one arteries that go forth from the heart, there is one only known as the *Suṣumnā-nāḍī*, by which the soul of the worshipper goes straight up to the brain, and breaking the skull proceeds by the path of the Sun to the *Brahmaloka*; and then having resided and enjoyed all the pleasures there till the end of the life of *Brahmadeva*, attains the Brahman along with the release of the latter. While in the case of those innumerable ignorant persons, who are neither the worshippers of the deities nor the realizers of the Brahman, there are the remaining one hundred *nāḍīs* through which the departing souls travel to all sorts of regions in accordance with their deeds.

The *Puruṣa*, as the inner *Ātman*, has taken his residence in the hearts of all persons, and as already described in 2,1,12-13, he reveals himself there as if he is of the size of a thumb. But instead of remaining satisfied with the vision of the *Ātman* as the immanent inner Self, one ought to extract the *Ātman* from his body as one would extract a blade of grass from its sheath, and see him again before him as the transcendent lustrous, Immortal Being, namely, the Brahman. This is all which the entire philosophy of the *Vedānta* aims at—this identification of the soul with the *Ātman*, and then again the identification of the *Ātman* with the Brahman. 4-17

Thus did *Naciketas* learn from the lord of death, the lore of the Brahman and the means of realizing him. And having done as he was instructed, he not only realized the Brahman, but, as a consequence of it, became completely free from all God-less desires, activities, and the fear of death. And, therefore, whosoever realizes first the vision of the *Ātman* would also be free from desires, ignorance, and fear of death. 18

Let *Om*, the Brahman, protect us both (the Guru and the disciple) and have command over us both; let us both be valorous; let our studies (in connection with our spiritual Good) shine forth with lustre; and let us not be jealous of each other. Let peace be with us; let peace be with us; let peace be with us.

no longer be the indicators of what he would then become, and so can no longer bind him also. 4-9

Why should not then one close his senses, stop the functions of one's mind and intellect and remain steadfast in the supra-sensuous, supramental, and supra-intellectual condition of the ever conscious Ātman? Let him form this habit of remaining close to the Ātman, so that he will gradually and automatically be able, as told in 1,3,13 and 2,2,1 to withdraw the attention, the energy, and the activities of his senses, mind, and intellect from the external and the internal objects of desires and direct them towards the Ātman only. What will happen by this practice of the suspension of the outgoing energy and the activities of the senses, etc., which we may call as the Ātmayoga or the Brahmayoga, is the opening of the subtle, supra-intellectual insight known as the intuitive eye, referred to above, and the end of the chain of miseries, disease, old-age, and the rounds of birth and death. Then will no one say that Brahman does not exist; for, he would know by his moral and devotional practice that he himself has an existence which is independent of and beyond the limitations of his senses, mind, and intellect, and that there must exist a supreme, conscious Being as both the material and the efficient cause of this universe, just as there are the potter and the clay as the efficient and the material causes of the vessels and jars. After knowing further that God is as immanent in him as in the world, the yogin would also come to know in due course that just as clay which, though immanent in the vessels and jars, is alone real, and not the names and forms of the jars that appear on the clay, even so God is different from his creation and so not only immanent but also transcendent. In short, it is to him who starts with the conviction that God exists, and who undergoes the yogic practice, that God reveals himself both as the immanent and the transcendent Reality of all. 10-13

And the moment all the knots of desires which had taken resort in the senses, mind, and the intellect of the yogin are cut asunder, he becomes the immortal Brahman even while he is living, and realizes that the Ātman he had seen within him is nothing else but Brahman. To what other region then can he go after death? As the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad says, his prāṇas do not depart; they become only merged in his body at

the time of death (4,4,6). But, in the case of those others, who instead of resorting to this lore of the Brahman, worship the lower deities such as the fire of the Nāciketa sacrifice, the sojourn of the soul to some other region after death is no doubt a fact. Out of the one hundred and one arteries that go forth from the heart, there is one only known as the Suṣumnā-nāḍī, by which the soul of the worshipper goes straight up to the brain, and breaking the skull proceeds by the path of the Sun to the Brahmaloka; and then having resided and enjoyed all the pleasures there till the end of the life of Brahmadeva, attains the Brahman along with the release of the latter. While in the case of those innumerable ignorant persons, who are neither the worshippers of the deities nor the realizers of the Brahman, there are the remaining one hundred nāḍīs through which the departing souls travel to all sorts of regions in accordance with their deeds.

The Puruṣa, as the inner Ātman, has taken his residence in the hearts of all persons, and as already described in 2,1,12-13, he reveals himself there as if he is of the size of a thumb. But instead of remaining satisfied with the vision of the Ātman as the immanent inner Self, one ought to extract the Ātman from his body as one would extract a blade of grass from its sheath, and see him again before him as the transcendent lustrous, Immortal Being, namely, the Brahman. This is all which the entire philosophy of the Vedānta aims at—this identification of the soul with the Ātman, and then again the identification of the Ātman with the Brahman. 4-17

Thus did Naciketas learn from the lord of death, the lore of the Brahman and the means of realizing him. And having done as he was instructed, he not only realized the Brahman, but, as a consequence of it, became completely free from all God-less desires, activities, and the fear of death. And, therefore, whosoever realizes first the vision of the Ātman would also be free from desires, ignorance, and fear of death. 18

Let Om, the Brahman, protect us both (the Guru and the disciple) and have command over us both; let us both be valorous; let our studies (in connection with our spiritual Good) shine forth with lustre; and let us not be jealous of each other. Let peace be with us; let peace be with us; let peace be with us.

Retrospect

The Kāṭha branch of the Kṛṣṇa-yajurveda contains an account of the Brahnavidyā as narrated by Yama to Naciketas. On seeing that his father had given away in charity such cows as were absolutely useless for any purpose, Naciketas thought to himself that instead of getting the fruit of the great sacrifice, Viśvajit which his father Vājaśravas had performed, he would only go to the regions of misery, and that therefore it was the duty of the son to save his father even at the cost of his own life. Naciketas was only a boy of about sixteen years. But inspired by this noble thought he asked his father three times as to what priest he was to be given in charity. Vājaśravas told him in a fit of anger that he would hand him over to Death. Naciketas bravely told his father to do as he had said, and not to go back on his words and thus prove himself a liar. The father did accordingly. Naciketas then went to the abode of Yama, the Lord of Death, but as the latter had gone out, he stayed at his doors for three days and nights without food and water. On returning home, Yama felt very sorry for what had happened in his absence, but then apologising to the Brahmin boy, worshipped him as his guest in all possible ways. Yama then gave him three boons. Naciketas used his first boon in obtaining the pleasure of his father; by the second he got the knowledge of the sacrificial fire which could be used for obtaining a place in the heaven. And, in exchange for the third boon, he requested Yama to instruct him with the knowledge of the Ātman.

Upon this, Yama exhorted him in several ways not to insist upon having the Ātma-jñāna, inasmuch as even gods were unable to understand the nature of it. Yama told him to ask for any other thing which would give him immense pleasure in return for his boon, no matter if it be wealth, power, long life, and even pleasures of the music and dance of the damsels in heaven. Seeing, however, that nothing could tempt Naciketas, Yama became so much pleased that he began to impart the knowledge of the Ātman to him. In the first place, one should learn to distinguish between the pleasant and the Good, though they are generally found to be mixed together in the worldly life. Secondly, as both of them cannot be pursued simultaneously and successfully for a long time, he must be prepared to lose the pleasant

in order to have the Good. For, those who are excessively attached to women and wealth can never be able to know the nature of immortality and the means to attain it. Like a blind man led by another blind man, they all come into the jaws of death again and over again. As the Ātman is the subtlest of all, no amount of reasoning, discussion, preaching or penance or Vedic study will be of any use in understanding its nature. In order to realize Him, one must serve the Spiritual teacher, who will then open the disciple's intuitive eye and teach him how to meditate on the divine name 'Om'.

Citing his own example, Yama makes it clear how the doing of meritorious actions such as performing sacrifices and the giving away of wealth in charity will only end in obtaining the short-lived pleasures or the temporary posts carrying with them powers and glory of the gods in heaven. Knowing then that everything else is perishable except the realization of the Ātman, what one should do is to control his outgoing senses, purify one's mind and make it steady, calm and composed, and then approaching the saints with great humility, get himself initiated into the lore of the Ātman. Narrow and sharp as the edge of a razor is the path of God. But one who has the courage to go by it will soon discover that the Ātman is the only one eternal, immovable witness and the inner self of all. He will have the direct, face to face, and immediate experience of the Ātman as his own immaculate Form, and then will be able to see Him in all places and at all times. He will thus discover that the Ātman is the same as the all-pervading Brahman; he will himself become identical and one with Brahman. Why then will he be particularly anxious about his tiny individuality or about the well-being of his body and the senses only? He will go beyond all grief and fear, since he has, by seeing the Ātman already gone beyond all his desires.

Know that the Ātman is awake even though the senses go to sleep. Know Him to be ever uncontaminated by the joys and the sorrows of life, and by the appearances which are superimposed upon him, just as the rope remains unaffected by the appearance of the serpent upon it. Neither the Sun, nor the moon, nor the stars and the lightning will be able to show the Ātman by their light; for, the light by which they shine is borrowed from the self-effulgent light of the Ātman only.

The Upaniṣad then describes the worldly existence as a great tree, with its root upward and its branches downwards. The root is the imperishable Brahman, but the branches are the innumerable perishable worlds. Excepting therefore the root, the rest of the tree is as short-lived, illusory, changing and as good as non-existent as an object in a dream, or water in a mirage. The tree grows out of the seed of desires, and is watered by the good or bad actions of creatures, and bears the fruits of joy and sorrow. With the realization of Brahman, however it withers and dies. Therefore, existing though, it does not exist for one who has realized the Brahman. From Brahman it comes into existence, in Brahman it is sustained, and in Brahman again it is dissolved. For, it is due to the fear of the Brahman, who is as if a raised thunderbolt, that fire burns, the Sun shines, wind blows and the Lord of Death runs in haste to perform his duty.

Why should not then one close his senses, stop the functions of his mind and intellect, and remain steadfast in the suprasensuous supramental, and supraintellectual condition of the ever-conscious Ātman? When all the knots of desires which have taken roots in the senses, the mind, and the intellect, are cut asunder and scattered away, he becomes the immortal Brahman even while he is living. In other words, he realizes that the Ātman is not only immanent but also transcendent, and that he is identical with Brahman and at the same time is the Self of all. Therefore, one ought to extract the immanent Ātman from his body as one would extract a blade of grass from its sheath and see Him before him as the transcendent, lustrous, immortal Being, namely the Brahman.

4

Munḍakopaniṣad

Introduction

The Upaniṣad is a part of the Atharva-veda and is not merely composed, as is believed by some, for the use of shavelings or monks, but also for all those who wish to have the knowledge about the Brahman and the way to realise it. It appears to have an halting attitude, or to be eclectic in character on account of the descriptions it contains of different topics. But this is because the Upaniṣad wishes us to know what is correct against the background of what is not correct. For instance, its praise of the sacrificial ritualism seems to be only provisional in character; for, immediately in the next few verses, it condemns it altogether. Similarly, the realistic aspect of the universe, and the pluralistic aspect of the souls are real so long as they are not resolved back into the Absolute. Similarly, the Personal is said to be more valuable than the Impersonal Absolute, for the only reason that mystical realization of God is more valuable than the merging of the finite in the Infinite, though the latter is the final truth of metaphysics as well as of experience. The Upaniṣad is equally taken as the authority by the up-holders of pluralism, dualism, and monism, though these views also can be taken as real, as the Upaniṣad probably intends, in an ascending order of the truth contained in them.

Apart from this very useful material, the real value of the Upaniṣad lies in giving us a sound advice for developing the ethico-spiritual worth of man. It teaches us to leave the aparā vidyā with disgust as it is fraught with misery, and to know the parā vidyā and the way to realize the Ātman. For this the aspirant must approach the spiritual teacher with humility and learn from him how to meditate on the divine Name. But this is not enough. For, to see God face to face, what is further required is control over the senses and a purified mind. And then, it will only be by the grace of God that He will shine before the devotee in golden lustre everywhere and at all times. And finally,

what the Upaniṣad tells us is that the mystic becomes not only similar to God but identical with Him, and that he comes to possess the power of God to save other souls who would care to approach him with humility.

Preview

1. Prayer to God to keep the body and senses unimpaired and healthy, so that one is enabled to sing praises unto HIM.
2. Distinction between the parā and the aparā vidyās.
3. The power of the intuitive faculty.
4. Creation, compared with the spider's thread out of its body.
5. Aparā vidyā is concerned with works and their fruits, while the parā, with the realization of the Brahman.
6. The priests and the sacrificers are like perishable boats which sink down along with karma and its fruits.
7. Approach the spiritual teacher with humility, if you wish to realize the Brahman.
8. Souls emanate from the Brahman, like sparks from fire.
9. Yet, the plurality of souls is only an appearance due to avidyā. There is one soul only namely the Brahman.
10. Transcendence and Impersonality are more important than immanence, and personality.
11. The phenomenal world is only a reminder to the noumenal, the creation to the creator.
12. That which is beyond causation should be the object of worship and meditation.
13. Treating Om as the bow and the soul as the arrow, pierce the target of the Brahman.
14. Like spokes in a wheel, all things are fixed in the Ātman.
15. None, not even karma, can ever transgress His command.
16. The moment the identity is realized between the jīva and the Brahman, desires come to an end, doubts are resolved, and karma becomes ineffective.
17. Brahman shines as dazzling gold on all sides of the mystic.
18. The mystic loves and plays with Ātman.
19. The jīva and the Brahman are as if two birds, living on the same perishable tree of the body, one enjoys and the other looks on.
20. Truth, penance, meditation, freedom from anger and desires, are the indispensable conditions of God-realization.
21. Worship of the saints is as effective as worship of God.
22. Unless God himself chooses His devotee, no human efforts will be successful in realizing Him.

23. Unlike gradual liberation, absolute liberation means the dissolution of name and form in the Brahman.
24. The knower of the Brahman becomes the Self of all.

MUṆḌAKA FIRST: PART FIRST

Let our ears hear words of auspiciousness, O gods; let us grow in strength by performing sacrifices, and let our eyes see only auspicious things; let our bodies, senses and limbs be unimpaired and healthy, so that we shall be able to sing praises unto you; and let us live in constant peace throughout the life as granted to us by God.

Brahmā was the first-born among the gods; and being endowed with all the best qualities, he became the creator and the protector of the worlds. It was he who first of all imparted to his eldest son, Atharva, the lore of the Brahman, which is rightly called the support of all other vidyās. Then in the ancient time, Atharva imparted it to the sage, Aṅgī who, in his turn imparted it to Satyavaha, the son of Bhāradvāja. And then again, as it was the tradition to impart the vidyā to the son or to the disciple Bhāradvāja also imparted it to Angiras. Afterwards, in course of time, a greatly respected person, named Śaunaka, humbly approached Angiras and asked him as to what it might be, which when known, everything else becomes known. 1-3

Aṅgiras said in reply that there are two vidyās, aparā (lower) and parā (higher). The aparā consists of the four Vedas, namely R̥gveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda and Atharvaveda, and of the six subsidiary lores, namely, Śikṣā, Kalpa (introduction to the Vedic study), Vyākaraṇa (grammar), Nirukta (etymology), Chandas (metre), and Jyotiṣa (astronomy). The Parā Vidyā, on the other hand, is that by which the realization of the Paramātmā takes place. This distinction need not, however, cause the doubt that the parā or the Brahma-vidyā, as also the Upaniṣads in which it is contained, must be as 'Veda-bāhya' that is as opposed to the teachings of the Vedas, as the heterodox schools of religion and philosophy are. What is intended to be impressed on the mind is that the Parā vidyā is not simply a heap of the Upaniṣadic words which can be committed to memory, but that it consists in the realization of the content and the meaning of them. This cannot be achieved by a mere intellectual understanding of the words or passages in the Upaniṣads, but by being initiated by a powerful, spiritual teacher who has himself realized the Brahman. One must therefore have felt first the

need of realizing it, as also the disgust at the hollowness and futility of all other things except the knowledge of the Brahman. Whereas the Vedic injunctions and prohibitions regarding the doing and the non-doing of certain ritualistic acts in a sacrifice are to be first understood intellectually and then practised at some future time when the sacrifice is actually to be performed, the Upaniṣadic knowledge about the Brahman and the actual realization of it in experience are possible at one and the same time. Those who are endowed with the intuitive faculty to see Him on all sides and come to know that He is the cause of all the movable and immovable world, notwithstanding his being imperceivable by the physical senses and as beyond the reach of the organs of action. He is not caused by anything beyond himself, he is bereft of any character such as big, small, white, black, etc.; he sees and hears and holds and walks without having eyes, ears, hands, or feet; he is eternally one and yet becomes many; he is all-pervading like the sky, and yet, because he does not possess even the subtle qualities of sound, touch, form, flavour, and smell, he is said to be subtler than even the very subtle essences or the 'tanmātras' which are known as the cause of the five elements and their five specific qualities. As noted above, it is He who is the subject-matter of the Parā vidyā, or the Brahmavidyā, it is that which one becomes directly able to perceive and become identical with it.

3-6

Just as the spider creates threads out of its body and winds them back into it, or just as herbs come out of the earth, or hair comes out of the skin of a living person, even so the world comes out of the eternal Being. There is however an order in which the world comes into being. No doubt, the Brahman does not change; and yet, (as the root 'Brh' in Brahman suggests growth) there comes about a sort of growth in it, the very moment he cherishes the desire to create the world. So, just as the seed grows into a sprout, the power of Brahman which is nothing but the Self-awareness of Brahman, manifested first in the form of food. From food came forth, the Prāṇa or the Hiraṇyagarbha who sustains the entire universe. Then came into being out of prāṇa, the inner sense known as the mind which, on account of its own desire, produced in order the five elements of ākāśa, wind, fire, water and earth, and the seven worlds known as Bhūḥ, Bhuvaḥ Svaḥ Tapaḥ, Janaḥ, Mahaḥ and Satyam, and

then the human beings with their various actions and fruits. 7-9

MUṆḌAKA FIRST: PART SECOND

Now, begins a further discussion of the subject-matter of the two vidyās with the view to pointing out by way of contrast how, in the first place, the aparā vidyā is concerned only with the affairs of this perishable worldly life, though it appears as a continuous and endless stream of actions and their fruits including the sacrifices and the consequent heavenly pleasures, and how in the second place, the parā vidyā is concerned with the attainment of the Brahmanic bliss and peace even while one lives on earth, and with the cessation of the dreadful and miserable 'saṁsāra'.

What passed on as Truth in the Tretāyuga, thousands of years ago, and what was discerned by the penetrating insight of the by-gone ṛsis (sages) in the form of hymns of the three Vedas amounted to the doing of the sacrificial actions with the view to obtaining the fulfilment of desires. This constituted the way of achieving merit in the ancient times. And so, it is recommended that oblations should be thrown in the sacrificial fire, when all its so-called seven flames (tongues) are fully ablaze. However, the performance of a sacrifice is a hazardous task, as it involves the possibility of encountering numerous obstacles. For instance, if there be an Agnihotrin (one who consecrates and maintains the sacred fire) who fails to offer the fortnightly oblations to it on the full moon and the new moon days, or fails to do as is required to be done during the four months from the 11th day of Āṣāḍha to the 10th day of Kārtika, and at the time of the reaping the new corn at the harvest, or fails in his daily worship of fire and of a worthy guest, or offers oblations in a wrong manner, he is deprived of the good fruits of all his actions done in all the seven worlds including the satyaloka. Nay, all his three generations before him and three generations after him become bereft of all merit. Those, who do not however, fortunately commit these errors and lapses, and who offer the oblations into the sacred fire according to the prescribed rules are carried away to the heaven, the abode of the Lord Indra. Then, the same seven tongues of the fire become the rays of the Sun,

as it were, and eulogizing the soul of the sacrificer after his death, in sweet terms such as 'Come this way, come this way; this is the holy Brahmāloka, the prize of your meritorious deeds' they worship him and carry him thither. 1-6

Yet whether pleasant or unpleasant, this is all that the works which have no bearing to the realization of Brahman can ever give to a man. It is all transitory, and so it results ultimately in misery. All the eighteen persons who are required to perform a sacrifice, namely, the sixteen priests, the sacrificer and his wife, are, in the first place, like perishable boats. Naturally, the Karma and its fruit which are necessarily dependent on them are equally perishable, just as milk kept in a jar becomes waste when the jar breaks into pieces. If, in spite of this there be fools who are deluded into believing that Karma alone, which has no connection with God-realization, would conduce to their ultimate good, and who therefore rejoice in doing it, what is reserved for them even after going to heaven is the return to this mortal world or even to some other lower world, and be subject to disease, old-age, and death. Being enveloped by avidyā, their intellect becomes clouded by their attachment to the fruits of actions. And being unable to know, on account of their conceit and self-praise, that the highest good of man consists in the realization of the Ātman, they become entangled by family ties and social relations only and so, they continue to perform various sacrifices; or they dig wells for people to drink water, and feel themselves blessed. Alas, such men, being blind themselves are further led by blind men alone. At the most, as the result of their philanthropic acts and of the worship of the deities in the sacrifices, they ascend to heaven to rejoice for a while, but only to return to the lower worlds after the merit is exhausted. 7-10

As opposed to this, there are those who under the sway of avidyā, do the penance of controlling the senses, who possess both learning and faith, who live in forest and earn their livelihood by begging of alms. Of such persons it can be said that both their merits and demerits are on the wane. After their death, their souls go by the northern path of the Sun to the Hiranyagarbha only. 11

Knowing thus fully well that the scope of avidyā is this much only and no further, a Brāhmaṇa should get himself convinced

that there is not a single thing in the whole of this dream-like saṁsāra, which can be called as imperishable, and that the whole of the Vedic karma-kāṇḍa aims at achieving perishable fruits only. And then, if he feels disgusted with such a prospect, he should, as a sign of humility, take fuel in hand and approach one who has conquered his senses, who is learned and firmly established in the realization of Brahman, for being initiated in the parā or the Brahma-vidyā. Thereupon, the spiritual teacher also should so impart the lore of the Brahman to the disciple as will enable him to realize the immutable, the immortal and the blissful Puruṣa. For, it becomes the duty of the spiritual teacher to save all those who surrender unto him. 12-13

MUṆḌAKA SECOND: PART FIRST

So far, was given mainly an account of the whole of the saṁsāra which is nothing but the effect and essence of Aparā vidyā, Now, will begin the discussion of the immutable Brahman, known as Puruṣa who is the root of saṁsāra and the subject-matter of Parā vidyā. This is the absolute Reality. What follows shows us the way as to how we may be able to perceive the Real directly.

Just as thousands of glittering scintillations arise from a blazing fire, even so are produced from that immutable Being innumerable, embodied souls; and it is in him alone that they become merged again. But this is not the whole truth; the coming into being and the going out of it of these souls is like the production of several portions of one space on account of its being enclosed by the walls of the jars or the rooms, and the dissolution of them all into one space again, the moment these walls are destroyed. There is thus no plurality of souls; the one Ātman alone appears as giving birth to many on account of its being embodied and limited in several ways. But when this body and all other limitations go away, there remains again the one Ātman only. It is on this account that the Ātman even while he is immanent, can be said to be the greatest of all the apparent names and forms which come and go on Him. Bereft of the names and forms whatever remains as transcendent, is the Brahman who is even greater than the immanent Ātman. It is this impersonal Being who is greater than the personal, and who

is therefore aptly described as the self-effulgent, self-existing, eternal, formless, flaw-less being who is both immanent and transcendent, unborn, and as being without disease, old age and death. He is the cause of both *prāṇa* and mind, in the sense that all the motive-powers of movement and action, and of will and knowledge have their source only in him. In short, the limitless Brahman remains ever uncontaminated and pure, in spite of his being for a while immanent and associated with whatever is produced from him, on account of his own power known as *avidyā* or *Māyā*. If all modifications as the *Chāndogya-upaniṣad* says (6,1,4), are modes of speech and have got nominal existence only, *prāṇa*, mind, senses and the five elements and whatever is produced out of them are as good as objects in a dream. How indeed can anyone say that he is endowed with a son, because he had seen a son born of him in a dream? Even so, that which is born out of *avidyā* cannot be said to characterize the Parabrahman. 1-3

Yet, to know the extraordinary power of Brahman which has caused the show of the creation of the vast universe is very helpful to have some idea of the limitless magnitude, glory and the resplendent nature of that transcendent, uncontaminated, and impersonal Being. So, it is described that Fire in the form of heaven is his head; the sun and the moon are his eyes; the quarters his ears; the Vedas, his speech; the wind, his *prāṇa*; the whole world, his heart; and the earth, his feet. He is the infinite God, known as *Viṣṇu*, the inner *Ātman* of all beings. From him is born the Sun who is merely some burning fuel in that great Fire; from him the rains which produce herbs, and corn and the valour in men and women from whom are born the various peoples. From him are produced the three Vedas, the sacrifices and their rituals and the rules regarding the time during which they are to be performed; from him the various deities, angels, human beings, cattle, birds, rice, barley, etc., the breaths, the penance, the faith, the truth-speaking, and celibacy. From him are born the senses and their power of seeing, hearing, etc., which are connected with the brain, and their corresponding several objects of knowledge and desires; from him the seas, the mountains, the rivers, the flavours, and the indwelling subtle soul, (*Ātman*) known as the 'Lingadeha'.

One who would realize this *Puruṣa*, this immortal highest

Brahman, would realize that Brahman alone is all this universe, including all the sacrifices, the penances and the charities and the fruits of them all, and that there remains no such thing as the universe or a part of it which is different from Brahman, and which therefore remains unknown. To know the Brahman is to know the universe as being included in the knowledge of Brahman. Nay, the realizer of Brahman realizes also that he himself is identical with Brahman, and so he becomes able to cut the knot of avidyā that was till then lying unnoticed in his heart. And this he achieves even while he is living. 4-10

MUṆḌAKA SECOND : PART SECOND

Angirasa exhorts his disciple, Śaunaka, to bear in mind fully the nature of the immutable Brahman and tells him the method of meditating upon it so that he should himself come to know that there is nothing so covetable as the realization of Brahman. He tells him again that the resplendent and the highest Brahman which is the ground and the support of all that moves and breathes and sees and hears, is very close to each and every one of us. It resides and moves in the hearts of all, and yet, it is not within the reach of ordinary sense-knowledge. That which goes beyond the law of causation has to be achieved by making it an object of worship. Indeed, that very immutable Brahman, which is of the nature of light, which is subtler than the subtlest, in which all the worlds are resting for support, which makes itself felt as Prāṇa, speech and mind, that immortal and eternally Real Being ought to be the only object of concentrated meditation. Take in your hand the bow of the Upaniṣadic, mystic symbol Om, and placing upon it the arrow of your soul, which has been already sharpened by devotion, stretch the bow with concentrated attention, and without getting yourself distracted by any other sensuous object or desire. And then, so pierce the target of the immutable Brahman, that your soul will become one with the Brahman. 1-4

Realize therefore this Ātman alone, this identity of your soul with Brahman, O my dear disciple, and leave all idle talk about other things, about the subject-matter of avidyā and the means recommended by it to obtain the perishable things in life. For,

in the Ātman alone, like spokes in a wheel, all the things in the universe, this earth, the heaven and the intermediary space, the mind, the prāṇa and the veins and the arteries are fixed; and it is the realization of the Ātman which alone will lead you, as if by a bridge, to the other shore of this miserable ocean of saṁsāra. It alone will liberate you. Therefore do realize the Ātman who is all active within you and in all the beings, by meditating upon the symbol Om, and go beyond avidyā without meeting any obstacle in your way. The majestic eminence of this omniscient Being is so great that, though from the viewpoint of avidyā he appears to be situated in the heart and as being affected by and depending upon the limitations of mind, prāṇa and food, none can ever transgress his command, whether it is the Sun, the moon or any other movable or immovable object or being; nor even the law of karma which inexorably binds the doer by his actions and fruits thereof. For, he is not only in the space of the heart, but also everywhere on earth or in the wide space beyond. Him it is that the wise see as spread out in all directions, and as being blissful, and as going beyond both happiness and sorrow of this worldly life. And lo, the moment the Brahman which is the cause of this world as also the world itself is visualized, and is realized as identical with one's own self, that very moment is destroyed the knot of desires which the mind had formed; doubts are dissolved, and the whole of the store of the fruits of the past as well as his future karma and its fruits becomes burnt. His present karma alone and that which has begun to fructify from the beginning of his birth remains for him to experience till his death. 5-8

Those therefore who visualize the Ātman as dazzling gold in the innermost, blissful sheath of their being, see the same as Brahman, on account of its being the light of lights, as going far beyond the world, and as being the purest of all. To realize the identity of the Ātman with Brahman is therefore impossible to be shown or discovered by the light of the Sun, the moon, and the stars; nor can it be discerned by the light of the lightning. For, it is by the borrowed light of the Brahman that all these look shining, in the first place; and then it is that all the things of the world are made visible by them. Brahman alone being self-effulgent, it is seen on all sides; Brahman on the left, Brahman on the right, Brahman above and below, Brahman in

front of the mystic, and Brahman behind him. Brahman indeed is this all; all this spread-out world is the immortal Brahman only. 9-11

MUNḌAKA THIRD: PART FIRST

Having dealt with the nature of the Brahman, the subject-matter of Parā Vidyā, and with the means and the method of meditation on Om in order to realize the Brahman, the Upaniṣad now turns to the discussion of some other auxiliary means such as truthfulness and penance, though, at the same time it takes care to emphasize the need of attending to the nature of the Brahman again and over again.

On this perishable tree of the human body, there dwell two birds as companions of each other. One of them is dependent upon and controlled by the other. It is the individual soul, the jīva, who being encompassed by the limitations of avidyā and by desires, eats the good and the bad fruits of his actions. But the other, who is in his real nature omniscient, free, and uncontaminated, appears as a mere witness of what the other does and enjoys, without himself doing or eating any of the fruits. In fact, his mere on-looking becomes a sufficient incentive for the other to be active, just as the king's presence alone is sufficient to make his subjects busy in doing their work. It is on account of his wrong belief that he is no more than a body-complex and a bundle of relations, that the jīva is tossed hither and thither like a gourd floating in the sea, and then being tired and helpless on account of enduring the buffets of fortune, he says about himself with bewilderment and grief that his has been after all a vain and dreary life.

But, if by some fortunate circumstance, perhaps as the result of his by-gone good actions, he comes across a saint who out of compassion for him would show him the way of virtue and devotion to God, and if by treading upon that path, he would visualize the face of God and come to understand his greatness, he would immediately be free from all grief. And, when he would see constantly the self-effulgent, golden coloured Puruṣa, the Lord and the creator of even the Hiranyagarbha or the Brahmadeva, he would, in course of time, become similar and

then identified with that very Puruṣa. Then, there would remain no difference between him and the Brahman. His sins and merits would be burnt; and he would become as uncontaminated as the Brahman is. In short, he would realize that he himself has become the Prāṇa or the inner Ātman of all beings. As he would then see nothing but the Ātman, hear or know nothing but the Ātman, it is natural that he should play with the Ātman and love the Ātman only. All his knowledge, his affection, and his activities will be centred in the Ātman alone, and not in any object or person other than the Ātman. Such a person alone can be called as the most active, as also the foremost among the realizers of Brahman, though he may not do any other activity beyond his silent and intense meditation. 1-4

The Upaniṣad tells us further that it is by means of constant practice of truth-speaking, penance, and concentration of the mind and the senses while meditating on the Name of God or while contemplating on the form of God, and by remaining celibate, that sages, who have made themselves free from anger and desires, have realized the Ātman as being lustrous and pure and as residing within their own body. Victorious would be Truth and not falsehood, for, truth alone would make the path of God wide and safe to tread upon. Truth constitutes the highest spiritual treasure which is obtained by sages who are content with what they have and have no further desires to be fulfilled. For them, the Ātman is quite near; they see him in their heart, though, at the same time, he is seen by them even in a far-off place. Though the Ātman is very difficult to be contemplated upon, he shines before the eyes of the mystic in a form which is both smaller than the smallest and larger than the largest. No doubt, he cannot be attained by any of the senses, by penance or by actions; yet, one who meditates on him is pure, and he can realize that immaculate God fully, provided however that he is graced by the divine illumination itself. In other words, the Ātman himself manifests with full grace in the heart of that person who has purified himself from all the dirt of anger and desires by having control over his senses. Nay, one who has thus purified his mind by control and by winning the grace of God, and one who worships the mystic who has realized the Ātman, can have all his desires or those of any one else, fulfilled and can obtain any world he may like. One who wishes

to have prosperity should therefore serve and worship a God-realized saint in the same way as he would worship God. Like God the saint also is one whose ideas or wishes become transformed into concrete, actual facts of experience. 5-10

MUṆḌAKA THIRD: PART SECOND

If, however, there be one who, having no desire of his own, worships the saint who has realized the self-illuminating highest Brahman, the ground and support of the universe, he too will be united with Brahman, and be free from birth and death. With the fulfilment of the highest desire, namely, the realization of the Ātman, his other desires come to an end; they lose their power of making the soul transmigrate to another body after death. Therefore, what man can do is to cherish at least the ardent desire and to put in his best efforts to realize the Ātman, though it is true that the Ātman can never be realized by the study of the Vedas nor by committing them to memory, nor by listening to preachings. In fact, whatever may be the human efforts, there would never take place the realization of God unless God himself chooses the person and manifests before him with all his glory. Grace of God cannot be had on demand; it is the gift of God and must come from him out of his own free choice. 1-3

It must be remembered that one who has no strength of will to undergo the severe discipline of spiritual life such as renunciation of desires, or one who cannot leave away his excessive attachment to the life of sense and cease falling into errors, can never realize the Ātman. Those on the other hand, who have come to self-consciousness, who are content with the bliss of God-realization, who are self-controlled, and who have led a spotless moral life, become after death, like the all-pervading Brahman in which they merge, diffused in all the universe. Those, however, who have firmly understood merely the principles of Vedānta, and who have led a good moral life and have renounced their desires (but have not come to the knowledge of the Ātman) reach after death to the abode of Brahmā and then along with him, they all are liberated at the time of the great end. Apart from this gradual liberation which falls to the

lot of those who reside in the Brahmaloka as 'companions' of Brahmā, there is the immediate and absolute liberation in the sense of being absorbed in the Brahman, reserved, as said above, for those who having attained to self-consciousness first, realize the Brahman even while they are living. What happens in the case of such persons is that all their prāṇas and senses, their accumulated karmas of the past which have not begun to fructify their intellect and souls, all become one with that eternal, imperishable Being. Or, as rivers flow into the sea and lose their names and forms, even so do the wise becomes absorbed in the self-effulgent, transcendent Puruṣa and lose their names and forms. 4-8

In short, one who realizes the Brahman becomes the Brahman. And in this process of becoming, none can dare bring any obstacle in his path; not even the greatest of the deities. For, the knower of Brahman becomes verily the Self of all. So, there is no wonder, if he becomes free from doubts, sins, and grief. His progeny also become free from disbelief in spiritual life. The spiritual teacher, however, should take great precaution before imparting this Brahmavidyā to another. The disciple ought to be a man of faith; he must have studied the scriptures and must be behaving accordingly; and above all, he must have such a great humility and preparedness to undergo severe discipline as will make him approach his teacher with fire on his head. For, one who has not got these qualifications is not fit for practising the Brahmavidyā. 9-11

Retrospect

The Upaniṣad which is a part of the Atharva-Veda contains the instruction about the Brahma-vidyā imparted by the sage Angirā to Śaunaka who requested him to say as to what it might be, which when known, everything else becomes known. Angirā began by saying that the Veda consists of two vidyās, aparā and parā. The former is concerned only with the affairs of this perishable worldly life which appears as a continual, endless stream of actions including the sacrifices and their fruits, namely, the worldly and the heavenly pleasures, while the latter is concerned with the Brahmanic bliss and peace even while one is on this earth, and with the cessation of the miserable and dreadful saṁsāra. What constituted truth in the Tretāyuga thousands of years ago, said Angirā, was the hymns of the three Vedas which advised the man to perform the various sacrifices in order to obtain the fulfilment of desires. But this sacrificial way of acquiring puṇya was according to him a hazardous task inasmuch as it was full of obstacles. There might be some error either in the manner in which the oblations are to be offered, or in saying the hymns, or in receiving the guests, or in doing some thing or the other, and thereby one might be deprived of the good fruits, which, however, are only transitory and ultimately end in misery. In the first place, all the eighteen persons, namely, the sixteen priests, the sacrificer and his wife who are required to perform a sacrifice, are all perishable. Naturally, in the second place, the sacrifice and its fruit which are dependent on them will be equally shortlived, though the fools get themselves strongly attached to them. Being enveloped by avidyā, their intellect becomes clouded, and so, they return again and again to this mortal world, after their merit is exhausted in heaven, and become subject to disease, old age, and death. Alas, themselves being blind they are led by blind men.

As opposed to these, those who have got intelligence, learning, and faith approach with humility one who is firmly established in the realization of Brahman, and get themselves initiated by him in the Brahma-vidyā. They then come to know that though the jīvas like sparks of fire appear to be many, they are one in the sense that the fire which is immanent in them is one, and that the real nature of every jīva is nothing else but the

Brahman which is immanent in them; and that further, just as divested of the names and forms of the sparks, the fire alone which is transcendent is real, even so, notwithstanding the apparent plurality of the souls, what remains eternally Real is the one, transcendent Brahman alone. Naturally, on account of its self-effulgence, and transcendence, the Brahman remains eternally uncontaminated and pure, in spite of its being immanent in the manifold things born out of avidyā; such as body, senses, mind, intellect, prāṇa, egoism and other innumerable objects of the world.

Angirā then exhorts his disciple to meditate on this Brahman, which goes beyond the law of causation, which though subtlest of all is the source and support of all. Take in your hand the bow of Om, sharpen it by your devotion, fix it upon the arrow in the form of your soul, and so pierce the target of the immutable Brahman, that you yourself will be one with it. Leave away all idle talk; for, it will be by this bridge of meditation alone that you will safely go to the other end of the ocean of saṁsāra. That very moment will be destroyed the knot of your desires, your doubts will be dissolved, and going beyond both happiness and sorrow, you will experience the joy and peace of being one with the Brahman. But this identity of the Ātman with the Brahman cannot be discerned by the light of the Sun, or of the moon, the stars, and the lightning; much less by fire. For, all this light is the borrowed light of the Brahman who is self-effulgent like dazzling gold. And then being one with Brahman he ejaculates that the Brahman is behind and in front of him, to his left and to his right, and on all sides. In that condition, it can be said about him that he loves and plays with the Ātman and is content with the Ātman.

The author of the upaniṣad, however, tells us finally that this absolute liberation due to the realization of the identity of the self and the Brahman cannot be achieved by any human efforts, unless God himself chooses the person and manifests before him with all His glory. The grace of God is a free gift, and not a reward for any human deserts. It will be no wonder if the desires are fulfilled by worshipping even a saint who has fully realized the Brahman; for, the saint, in realizing the Brahman loses his very name and form even while he is living in body and flesh.

5

Praśnopaniṣad

Introduction

Praśnopaniṣad is the Brāhmaṇopaniṣad while the Muṇḍaka is the Mantropaniṣad of the Atharva-Veda. Praśnopaniṣad also deals with the distinction between the aparā and the Parā Vidyā, as also with the cosmological problem regarding the creation of the world, and with the conditions of sleep and dream. What is important to remember from the spiritual point of view is that the Upaniṣad, like the Muṇḍaka highly recommends the upāsanā of meditation on Om which is both the symbol and the Name of God, and which therefore is the means of being united with Him. It tells us further that the kind of immortal life for which man should aspire is to become lost, like a river in an ocean, in the one Supreme Being and not to have behind him any trace of his former name or form.

Preview

Question First

1. Pippalāda tells Kabandhi Kātyāyana in reply to his question that it was Prajāpati who created the universe out of the pair of Rayi and Prāṇa.
2. Rayi means the entire material world and Prāṇa means the experiencer or the bhoktā.
3. Rayi also means the moon, the night, the dark half of the month and the southern path; and Prāṇa means the Sun; the day, the bright half of the month; and the northern path of the gods.
4. Those who are merely engrossed in doing actions and are averse to the doing of devotional worship are prevented from entering the path of the gods.

Question Second

5. Pippalāda says to Bhārgava Vaidarbhi that all the beings are upheld by the five elements; but that these and the five sense-organs are supported by the only one Reality behind them, namely, the Prāṇa.
6. For, with the departure of the chief Prāṇa, the lower prāṇas, that is, the senses began to depart, and with the entrance of Prāṇa in the body, they began to enter with strength and vitality.
7. Prāṇa was then praised as being the Prajāpati, the Sun, the Moon, the Fire, Indra, Rudra, the Vedas and so on.

Question Third

8. To Kausalya Āśvalāyana Pippalāda tells that it is the Ātman from whom the Prāṇa is originated. Dividing himself into five lower prāṇas or the senses, he enables them to function.
9. As identical with Prajāpati, the Prāṇa is the source and support of the cosmos; and as identical with the Ātman, he is the source and support of the psychical activities.

Question Fourth

10. To Sauryāyaṇ Gārgya, Pippalāda says that it is the Mind which like Prāṇa remains awake during the dreaming condition, but which has also the capacity of creating things out of memory and imagination, and of enjoying them simultaneously.
11. During deep sleep, however, the mind is merged in the supreme Puruṣa, who then can be said to be the sole enjoyer of the bliss of the deep sleep.

Question Fifth

12. To Satyakāma Śaibya, Pippalāda says that meditation on the first, second and the third part of Om (aum) will respectively bring back the meditator to the mortal world, or bring him back after first carrying him to the Moon, or reach him to Brahmaloḥa, from where, along with Hiraṇyagarbha, he will be released gradually.
13. But the meditator on all the three parts of Om taken together enjoys the peace, the unperturbedness, the immortality and the fearlessness of Brahman.
14. Meditation on Om is thus capable of reaching a man to Sa-guṇa Brahman, or making him united with the Nirguṇa Brahman, as he likes.

Question Sixth

15. And finally to Sukeśin Bhāradvāja, Pippalāda says that the Puruṣa who resides in the heart of man is partless, while the so-called 'Kalās' and the body are made up of parts.
16. Ultimately, the sixteen kalās which are produced out of the great, eternal Puruṣa, become dissolved in Him. And just as rivers which run into the sea lose their names and forms, and there remains one sea only, even so the sixteen kalās and every thing else in the world are dissolved in the one Brahman without leaving behind any trace of names and forms, and there remains only the undifferentiated, one, eternal Brahman.
17. Know ye therefore this Puruṣa, and then Death can do you no harm.

Text

Let our ears hear words of auspiciousness, O gods; let us grow in strength by performing sacrifices, and let our eyes see only auspicious things; let our bodies, senses, and limbs be healthy and unimpaired, so that we shall be able to sing praises unto you; and let us live in constant peace throughout the life as granted to us by God.

PRAŚNA (QUESTION)-1

There were six sages who had the wrong notion that the *saguṇa* or the lower Brahman was just the same as the *nirguṇa* or the highest Brahman, and so they were greatly devoted in performing sacrifices and in doing all other activities according to the instructions of the Vedas. Soon, however, they thought that the highest Brahman must have been of a different nature; and so with the view to making a thorough quest in the matter, they approached with great humility the sage Pippalāda. On knowing from them why they had come, Pippalāda asked them all to stay in his house for one year as celibate disciples and, after practising penance with faith as they had done before they came to him, ask him any questions as they wished. He would then reply, he said, according to his ability.

Then, after having completed the penance for one year, one of them, Kabandhi Kātyāyana, asked Pippalāda as to who was responsible for producing all these things and beings in this world. To this Pippalāda said in reply that it was Prajāpati, the Lord of all, who, having entertained the desire for creating the universe, practised a great penance in the form of bringing back to his mind, how on a former occasion he had created it. And when as the result of his penance, he became once again endowed with the knowledge about the creation and thought he was able to execute the plan, he first produced the pair of Rayi and Prāṇa. By Rayi is meant all the perceptible and experiential world such as the gross vegetable food, as also the subtle experiences of sound, touch, form, flavour, and smell. As the moon is the cause of the nourishment and the growth of this all, by Rayi is meant the moon also. Prāṇa, on the other hand, is

the experiencer, the eater, or the 'bhoktā' of all that can be experienced or eaten (the bhogya). It is also known as the Sun, who by his rays envelops all the quarters and enters into all the beings in the form of prāṇa or the principle of life itself, and enables them thereby to eat the food, that is to experience all the subjective and the objective world of sense. It is also the Sun who assumes the form of Vaiśvānara, or the Fire in the stomach, and digests the food. It is this Sun whom the great sages of the past have realized as the one, immanent Ātman of all the beings; as the lustre in the eye which enables them to see; as one who assumes infinite forms; the one who knows himself as the Ātman; the one who shines and heats the universe by his innumerable rays; and who rises in the hearts of all and is the support of their very life. 1-8

So, the sun and the moon together are nothing but the Prajāpati in a different form and are the cause of day and night, as also of the two solstices, the northern and the southern. They go to form one year. Now, those who are engaged in performing sacrifices, penance and in studying the Vedas and in doing the actions according to their instructions, or in doing philanthropic acts, such as the building of the temples, digging of wells, etc., or in giving away wealth and other things in charity, go after death by the 'southern path of the fathers' to the world of the moon or Rayi, but return again to this mortal world. On the other hand, those who observe celibacy, control their senses and mind, and worship the Prajāpati and the Sun by thinking constantly that they are identical with them, go by the 'northern path of the gods' to the Sun from where there is no return. For, it is the Sun who is the support of the whole of the cosmos and unlike the moon, being imperishable, and unmodifiable, is the ultimate and the fearless destiny of all. Therefore it is that those who are merely engrossed in doing actions and are averse to the doing of devotional worship are prevented from going on the path of the gods.

It is the Sun again who causes the year to be divided into seasons which might be considered to be either five or six, and into twelve months, each one of which is further divided into two fortnights, the bright and the dark. The months are the limbs of his body; and the five or the six seasons are as if his feet, by means of which he is perpetually moving and moving

through the regions of the third heaven. His rays are as if the seven horses (i.e., the seven colours which are in his rays) which herald the arrival of his chariot which has only one wheel. In the hub of that wheel or the disc of the sun are fixed the six spokes of the seasons. The sun is, thus, the representative of that God of eternal Time, known as the Prajāpati or the Prāṇa or the Fire or the devourer of all, as we have already seen. He is the eternal knower, the Father and the nourishment in the form of food and water (Rayi, moon and all the material world of objects of desires and experiences). Similarly again, the day is the Prāṇa, and the night is the food, eaten by the Prāṇa. Those, however, who look upon this Prāṇa as the Ātman of all, and those who do not think that there is any essential difference between the bright and the dark fortnights, perform their sacrifices even during the dark fortnight and derive the same benefits as they could have derived by performing them in the bright fortnight. Those, on the other hand, who not knowing anything about the all-pervading nature of the Prāṇa, wrongly think that the dark fortnight is made up of ignorance only can never derive the good fruits of their sacrifices even if they perform them during the days of the bright fortnight. Incidentally, it must be said that those who satisfy their sex during daytime destroy themselves by destroying the energy of the Prāṇa, while those who cohabit on proper occasions during night preserve it by being moderate and celibate to some extent at least. Further, it is the same Prajāpati or Prāṇa, who first assumes the forms of barley or rice, and then, when the latter is eaten, the male assumes the form of semen and produces creatures like men and others. This is what is ordinarily seen in the world. Yet for those who are merely interested in doing actions, and for those who are, as said above, celibate in spite of satisfying the sexual urge, and who are always truthful in word and deed, the unseen fruit is that after death, they go by the southern path of the fathers to the world of the moon. 9-15

On the other hand, those who are free from crookedness, falsehood, and the illusion of Māyā, and who are not only interested in the doing of actions, but also engage themselves in devotional worship, go after death by the northern path of the dogs to the world of the Sun which, unlike that of the moon, is pure and not amenable to increase or decrease. 16

PRAŚNA-2

(Now that in reply to the first question Prajāpati or Prāṇa is shown by Pippalāda to be the only Reality which is the origin and the supporter of the whole of the creation, it will be further shown by way of replying this second question that the same Prāṇa is no doubt located in the physical body, but that it is altogether different from it. Pippalāda wants to show that one can understand that the physical body is not the Ātman, only after understanding that Prāṇa being the subtlest of all is the real support of the body and the senses.)

Then came forward Bhārgava of the country of Videha, and he said to Pippalāda, 'Sir, how many are the presiding deities which support this human body, how many of them are self-illuminating, and which of them is the foremost of all?' Pippalāda replied that space, wind, fire, water, and earth are the five deities in the form of the elements which are the causes of producing the body and its limbs like hands and feet. The latter are useful in making all sorts of activities, but they lack self-illumination. The sense organs of tongue, eye and ear are said to be self-illuminating in the sense of their being the instruments of acquiring knowledge. Prāṇa, however, is the only deity which supports the body, is self-illuminating, and which illumining the body and the senses, directs and enables them to do their functions.

Notwithstanding this, all the other divinities, namely, the organs of action and knowledge, began to say with pride that it is they who, like the strings of a harp or like the pillars of a palace, keep the body intact and enable it to move. Nay, they began to dispute among themselves, each one saying that he is the chiefest of all. Upon this, Prāṇa, who is really the chiefest of them all, warned them not to be illuded and puffed up with pride. 'In fact, it is I', said he, 'who after dividing myself in five smaller prāṇas support this perishable and dirty body.' But this did not bring any conviction to the other deities. Whereupon with a view to convincing them, and with an equal pride as if, the moment the Chief Prāṇa began to depart from the body, all the other Prāṇas (senses) lost their power and began to depart after him. But, when the Prāṇa ceased to depart, they also ceased to depart, and began to function as usual. All this happened just

like the behaviour of the bees who fly away when the queen-bee flies away, or come back after she comes back. The senses thus came to know fully well that all their energy, activities and knowledge depended upon the power of the Prāṇa, and so they began to praise it. 1-4

It is Prāṇa, they said, who becomes the fire and burns; it is Prāṇa who becomes the sun and shines. It is he who becomes Indra, who causes the rains, who becomes the wind, the earth, the moon, the food, the existing and the non-existing, as also the immortal Being. Like the spokes in the navel of the wheel of a chariot, everything is rooted in the Prāṇa alone, whether they are hymns of R̥gveda, Yajurveda, or Sāmaveda, or the Sacrifice itself, or the Kṣatriyas and the Brāhmaṇas. 'O Prāṇa,' they exclaimed joyfully, 'you are the Prajāpati; it is you who move even in the foetus and come to birth as the offspring which resembles the parents; all these senses bring homage unto you, since you are the inner self of them all, and who are their protector; it is you who carry the oblations to the gods and the fathers; you are the Indra; you are the Rudra who protects and destroys the universe; you are the sun, the lord of the stars, who are unceasingly traversing the entire sky; it is you who come as clouds, and pouring rains after rains, make the people rejoice with the prospect of the abundance of harvest. Being the first-born, you are the purest of all, and so do not stand in need of being purified by any other being; you are the fire, known as Ekaṛṣi, the enjoyer of all kinds of oblations; you, the kind-hearted Father of all, the Mātariśvan. Kindly do not destroy the speech, the eye, the ear and the mind in which you are immaculately present, by departing from the body. Whatever exists here and in the heaven, and whatever glory, valour, and knowledge is seen in the Kṣatriyas and the Brāhmaṇas, belongs to you. Give that all to us, and protect us as the mother protects her children.' 5-13

(Thus did Bhārgava understand that the body as such has little inherent value and that Prāṇa is the cause of all this worldly existence.)

PRAŚNA-3

(With all the powers and the attributes of Prāṇa as mentioned

in the discussion of the second question, there still remains the further inquiry to be made about it, namely, regarding the origin of the Prāṇa itself, and the way in which it should be worshipped.)

Then comes Kausalya Āśvalāyana who asks a series of questions, because he thought that Prāṇa too must only be an effect of something else, since it divides itself into its component parts and becomes mixed up with different functions. Whence does the Prāṇa come into being, how does he enter into the body, how does he retain his essential nature inspite of his dividing himself, how does he depart from the body, and how does he uphold the external and the internal worlds of experience? To this Pippalāda said, 'You have asked me questions which are too difficult indeed. For, in the first place, the nature of Prāṇa itself cannot be easily comprehended; and so, in the second place, it will be much more difficult to know how and from whom it has originated. Yet, as you are a steadfast seeker of Brahman, I shall reply your questions. It is the Ātman from whom the Prāṇa is originated. It is located in that great Puruṣa, the Brahman, just as the shadow of a man can be said to be located in the man himself; and it enters into the body along with the fruits of the past actions. Then, like a sovereign who appoints his persons to different posts and in different places, the chief Prāṇa too appoints the lower prāṇas, namely, the senses of eye, ear, etc., in different parts of the body and makes them function in different ways. Himself remaining in his own nature as the Chief Prāṇa in the mouth, the nose, the eye, and the ear, he makes them speak, inhale and exhale the wind, see and hear respectively. He makes the Apāna to occupy the region of the anus and the organs of generation and causes them to throw out the excreta and the urine. Between the prāṇa and the apāna, in the region of the navel, is placed the Samāna, which is given the function of distributing equally to all the parts of the body, a portion of the energy and vitality that is produced on account of the digestion of the food and water by the Vaiśvānara fire in the stomach. It is from this fire which rises afterwards up to the region of the heart that there shoot up seven flames, as it were, in the forms of two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and one tongue in the mouth, and makes the soul to have the experience of forms, sounds, smells, and flavours. 1-5

The lotus-like fleshy heart is the seat of the subtle Ātman known as the 'Līṅgātmā'. From within the cavity or the space of the heart are spread out one hundred and one main arteries, every one of which is branched off into one hundred sub-arteries, each one of which is branched off into extremely minute arteries, amounting to seventytwo thousand. It is through all these arteries, that the prāṇa moves; and so, on account of its all-pervading nature it is known as 'Vyāna'. It pervades through all the joints, the shoulders, the vital parts, as also through the movements of the prāṇa, apāna, and samāna. And so, it is the Vyāna which gives power and energy to all the limbs and senses to do their functions. As for the Udāna, it rises by the Suṣumnā-nāḍī, which is the only one amidst the millions of arteries which goes up straight to the top of the brain, and taking the soul after it, departs from the body, and reaches it either to the regions of the blessed or to those of the condemned, according to the soul's good or bad actions on the earth. In case, the merit and the demerit would balance each other, the soul is brought back by Udāna to the mortal world of men.

As to how the Prāṇa conducts the functioning of the body and the senses, we have to note, in the first place, that it is the presiding deities of the five elements, as forms of prāṇa, that are responsible for upholding all the cosmos, and that secondly, it is these deities or prāṇas that enable the senses and other organs of the body to function in their own specific ways. For instance, this very Sun in the heavens is a form of the external prāṇa. It is he who endows the eyes with the power to see as soon as he rises in the heavens. Even so, all the other senses derive their power of knowing the external and the internal world from the prāṇas in the form of other four elements, namely, fire, air, water and earth, and are also known, in a derivative sense, by the same name of Prāṇa. In the same way, had not the presiding deity of the earth compelled the apāna in the body to remain downwards only, the man would have lost his balance or blown away in space far away from the earth. The samāna which dwells in the region between the prāṇa and apāna and is the cause of digesting food and water, is the replica of the wind that exists in the external world between the earth and the heaven. And just as the wind is all-pervading, so also is the vyāna in the body.

And lastly, the soul's migration from one body to another is due to Udāna who is none else but the vital glow and the essence of the living body as well as the representative of the Light which supports the cosmos. When the man is about to die, all the limbs and the senses lose their energy and power; and all of them, including the mind and its desires, are collected in the soul; and then, along with the latter, the Udāna reaches them all according to the past actions to the regions of the gods, or to hell or to the mortal world.

Whoever contemplates over the nature of this prāṇa and how he enters in the body, how dividing himself into five prāṇas, he sustains the functions of the senses, how he pervades all the internal and external things in the universe, and finally, how he departs from the body and assumes another, attains the immortal nature of the Prāṇa himself. Even the future generations of one who worships the prāṇa will enjoy a long and prosperous life.

6-12

PRAŚNA-4

Till now, in the discussion over the first three questions, Pippalāda dealt with problems regarding only the lower vidyā, that is those which arose in connection with the transitory, mundane life, and with the means and the ends which ordinary common people cherish. Now will begin the discussion regarding the higher Vidyā, that is, regarding the Puruṣa who is beyond all means and ends; beyond the senses, mind and prāṇa, who is imperishable, unaffected, and full of bliss and peace, and who, though unborn, is both immanent and transcendent. The purpose of this is to show, as the second part of Muṇḍakopaniṣad also shows, how all that exists originates from the Brahman alone, and how in the Brahman alone it is all dissolved.

Then comes the turn of Gārgya Sauryāyana. He asked Pippalāda as to which of the senses go to rest in this human body, and which of them keep always awake. Who is he who experiences the dreams, who enjoys the bliss of sleep, and who is he in whom the whole of the world is dissolved?

Pippalāda replied that just as the rays of the rising sun spread out in all directions, but when the sun sets they can be

said to be resting in him alone; even so, the senses start to do their respective functions of seeing, hearing, etc., the moment the chief among them, namely, the mind becomes active by entertaining certain desires of its own, and directs the senses to function accordingly. During sleep, however, when the mind suspends its desires, the senses also are, for the time being, cut off from their objects; and so go to rest in the mind only. That is why no one can hear in sleep; nor can he see, smell, taste, touch, speak, take, leave, move, or be joyful.

It is only the fires in the form of the five *prāṇas* that keep awake during sleep. Just as at a sacrifice, the main fire known as 'Āhavanīya' in which the oblations are thrown, is brought forth from the already existing fire in the house of one who worships the fire, even so, the main vital *prāṇa* which is induced to remain moving in the mouth and the nostrils by another fire known as the *apāna* or the wind that is exhaled, keeps awake even when the senses go to sleep. The third fire is the *prāṇa* known as *Vyāna*, which though all-pervading starts from the right or the southern side of the heart, and is therefore like the southern fire on the altar of sacrifice. This fire is the cause of the digestion of the food in the abdomen even during sleep. Considering, however, that *prāṇa* and *apāna*, or the inhaling and exhaling of breaths, are as if the oblations offered in the sacrifice, there would be required another *prāṇa* who would equally distribute the energy and the vitality generated by the oblations throughout all the parts of the body. *Samāna* is that fire which also keeps awake like the *Hotā* who sees that the oblations are properly put in the fire. This means that in the case of a person who believes in this kind of sacrifice and worships the fire, his sleep also becomes verily a sacrifice. Mind then will occupy the position of the sacrificer himself; and so far as the fruit of the sacrifice is concerned, it will be the union of the mind with the Brahman every night during sleep. And this is done by *Udāna*. 1-4

As for the question who it is who experiences the dreams, *Pippalāda* said that it is none else but this deity of the mind itself, which also, like the *prāṇas*, is awake and active during the dreaming condition of man, but which unlike the *prāṇas* becomes inactive and merged in the *Ātman* (Soul) during sound sleep. The mind itself is free enough to create the objects of its dreams,

and to become at the same time the experiencer of them all. To say so is neither to rob the Ātman of its inherent perfect freedom and its self-illuminational nature, nor to endow the mind which is only an instrument with these characteristics beyond a degree which is consistent with the transitory show of avidyā. The Ātman neither sleeps nor dreams; nor is he contaminated by anything else. In fact, there being nothing beyond the Ātman, who should see whom or what? But when it is said that the Jīvātman sees the objects in a dream, it simply means that the Ātman sees them as if they are created by the Upādhis (limitations) of mind. In other words, the Ātman assumes the form of mind and sees the creations of the mind in a dream. That they are so created by the mind only follows from the fact that the senses of seeing, hearing, etc., are all inactive and are merged in the mind. And what is meant by the creation of the mind is only the reproduction of persons or things which were seen or heard before, and about which there lingers in the mind the desire to see them again. So far as the memory is concerned it might go far beyond the existing life; that is, it might help the mind not only to reproduce, but to produce anew persons or things or events of the innumerable past lives. All this therefore is created by the mind in a dream. 5

But when the activity of the mind comes to a standstill on account of there being excess of bile or its being overpowered by light (of the Ātman), it begins to take rest in dreamless sound sleep, and the soul enjoys great happiness that arises in the body. Then everything else, such as desires, activities, the consciousness of body and senses, in a word, all the world as created by Avidyā, becomes merged in the one Ātman only, just as birds fly to their nests on the trees at the approach of the evening. So, not only the gross elements of earth, water, fire, air, and space, but also the subtle elements or essences (Tanmātras) out of which they are produced, namely, smell, flavour, form, touch, and sound; not only the senses of the eye, the ear, the nose, the tongue, and the skin, but also all the objects which can be sensed and known as the visual, the auditory, the olfactory, the gustatory, and the tactual; further again, not only the organs of actions, namely tongue, hands, feet, organs of generation and anus, but also their activities of speaking, holding, walking, sexual enjoyment, and giving out excreta; and still more, the mind

and its imaginings; the intellect and the conceivable ideas; egoism and all that about which one can be egoistic; attention and that which can be attended to; lustre and that which can be seen or felt as lustrous; and the *prāṇas* and whatever is supported and sustained by them; all these and the entire, phenomenal world as determined by cause and effect and consisting of names and forms, are merged in the *Ātman* during the condition of sound sleep. 6-8

As for the soul or the *jivātman* who is none else but the *Ātman*, it is natural that he would find the sound sleep as a joyful condition. Just as the reflection of the Sun in water occurs not only on account of the water being there, but also on account of the entrance of the sun as if in the water, even so the *jivātman* is none else but the highest *Ātman* or the Brahman who has, so to say, entered into the body. Then it is that the *jivātman* is said to be the knower, the doer, the enjoyer, the seer, the hearer, the thinker and so on. But, just as with the evaporation of the water, the reflection of the Sun also disappears, and not the sun in the sky, even so, what disappears during sound sleep is the apparent, false knowledge of the whole of the external world as also that of the *upādhis* of body, senses, mind, intellect and egoism, and not the real nature of the *jivātman* who is identical with the one blissful, imperishable support of all, namely, the *Ātman*. And that is why there is joy in sound sleep.

All the same, there being no conscious enjoyment of the blissful *Ātman* during sleep, but only a natural forgetfulness of the joys and sorrows and of the knowledge of the perishable objects of the world, Pippalāda instructs Gārgya by saying that whoever becomes free from all desires and realizes that the *Ātman* is both immanent and transcendent, beyond mind and *prāṇa*, bereft of all qualities, names and forms, and as being pure, resplendent and blissful, becomes one with him, and as such as omniscient and as all-pervading as the *Ātman* is. 9-11

PRAŚNA-5

Thereupon, impelled by the desire to know the Brahman (*Ātman*), Satyakāma, the son of Śibi, asked Pippalāda as to

what world is attained by a person who meditates upon Om (Aum) with one-pointed devotion till the end of his life. Pippalāda replied that inasmuch as Om (aum) is the symbol of both the lower and the higher (saṁguṇa and nirguṇa) Brahman, and as it is very close to both of them, it can very well be said that it is identical with both. Therefore one who meditates upon it attains to anyone of the Brahman, as he likes.

Though 'aum' is one syllable only and ought to be meditated upon by uttering it as one unit, it can be uttered and meditated upon exclusively also in its three different parts, namely, the sounds produced by a, u, and m. Though the former kind of meditation on the whole of Aum may lead one, according to one's own wish, to the direct realization of the highest nirguṇa Brahman, the latter three kinds of meditation on the three parts of aum, on the other hand, are all with reference to the lower or the saṁguṇa Brahman. The fruits of these will be the return after death to the mortal world, either immediate or deferred, or at best a gradual liberation along with the deity of the Brahmaloṇa.

To explain this a little further, the person who meditates on first part of Aum, namely, 'A', (i.e. on the sound corresponding to 'A') is born again as a man; and then being endowed with faith, he practises penance and worships the Guru and God, and thereby enjoys glory and power. This becomes possible because the part of Aum indicated by 'A' constitutes in essence the hymns of Ṛgveda, and it is these latter which have the power to endow the meditator with the human body again in the new birth. Here, the knowledge and meditation on even a part of Aum is a gain, and so cannot be construed as a defect. Even so, one who meditates on the second part of Aum, namely, on the sound corresponding to 'U', is carried after death by the hymns of Yajurveda to the world of the moon (soma). But after staying there for some time in order to enjoy the pleasures and glories of that world, he has to return again to the mortal world. As against these two meditators one who meditates on the third part of Aum, namely, 'M' which constitutes the hymns of Sāmaveda, is carried after death to the world of the sun where, contemplating on the Puruṣa in the Sun, he becomes merged and identified with the Sun. Naturally, his sins being burnt, he becomes as pure and resplendent as the Sun, just as a serpent lives a new life after casting off its old skin. He is then raised to the

Brahmaloka or the Satyaloka, the world of the lord Hiraṇyagarbha (the golden coloured resplendent Being), who is the support, the inner and the subtle Self, (the *linga-deha*) of the whole of the cosmos, and from there gets the direct vision of the highest Brahman, the *Paramātmān* or the *Puruṣa*, who is even beyond Hiraṇyagarbha. It is this third kind of meditator who, unlike the first two, gets what is known as 'gradual liberation' (*Krama-mukti*); he becomes one with the Parabrahma, along with the Hiraṇyagarbha.

The three parts of Aum which represent the three Vedas, as referred to above, are, however, amenable to the domination of death, if meditated upon severally. Yet, being connected with each other they can also be simultaneously meditated upon as constituting one syllable only, and as referring to the blissful *Ātman* alone. Then, there will be simultaneous knowledge of the three *Puruṣas*, namely, the *Vaiśvānara* who is the presiding deity of the gross body and of the wakeful condition; the Hiraṇyagarbha or the *Puruṣa* made up of light who is the lord of the subtle body (*lingadeha*) and the condition of dream; and the *Īśvara* or the *Prājña* who is the lord of dreamless sleep during which nothing is known in an articulate manner. Nay, the meditation on the three parts taken together, if done with the intention and faith that it is the meditation of the Parabrahma itself, will enable the meditator to realize that he is identical with it, and as such, enjoy the peace, the tranquility, the unperturbedness, the immortality and the fearlessness of the Brahman.

PRAŚNA SIXTH

Finally, came the turn of Sukeśa, the son of Bhāradvāja. He first told Pippalāda how a prince, named Hiraṇyanābha of the country Kosala, had approached him to enquire whether he had the knowledge of that *Puruṣa* who is said to possess sixteen parts (*kalās*); how he told the prince that he had no knowledge of that *Puruṣa*; how in order to convince him that he was speaking the truth, he told the prince that whosoever speaks the untruth would be dried up from the roots and would lose all that is valuable here on this earth and in the worlds beyond; and how afterwards the prince silently rode off in his chariot to his country. Bhārad-

vāja then requested the Guru to tell him as to where that Puruṣa could be found at all.

(It was already noticed in question 4 (6-9), that the entire world along with the soul is merged in the one imperishable Being during sound sleep. From this it follows that during the time of dissolution also, everything is merged back in the same imperishable Puruṣa, and that at the time of creation the whole of it must be springing forth anew, just as things forgotten in sleep are remembered after being awakened. Prāṇa also was mentioned as being produced out of the Ātman (Pra. 3.3); and in Pra. 4, 10, it was told that one who realizes this Ātman becomes omniscient and all-pervading. Hence, it was felt by Bhāradvāja that to have the knowledge of this Puruṣa was absolutely necessary.)

That Puruṣa dwells here in this very human body, said Pippalāda; here in the lotus-like region of the heart. And what are known as the sixteen parts are all wrongly imposed upon that unborn, imperishable and uncontaminable Puruṣa. Notwithstanding what the bewildered among men say that it is the Caitanya (Brahman) itself which appears in the various forms of jars and other things and is being destroyed every moment along with the destruction of the latter, or that the consciousness (Caitanya) itself is the property that emerges out of the combination of elements, we must remember what the Śruti tells us about the Brahman in different passages that it is the 'eternal Truth and knowledge' (Tai. 2.1, 1) 'it is knowledge and bliss' (Br. 3, 9, 28), and it remains steadfast in its own nature, though the things in which it is immanent might change in all possible ways, and might even perish. Existence and non-existence can both be predicated of things which are shortlived; but non-existence can never be predicated of the eternal knower. For, in the absence of the latter, the knowable world would never be the object of anyone's knowledge as it happens during sleep; but in the absence of the knowable world, the light of Caitanya which could have manifested it, might continue to shine. Even the upholder of the 'doctrine of momentariness' will not own that he has lost his eyesight, when he becomes unable to see and distinguish the things in darkness. Even his arbitrary opinion that along with the non-existence of the knowable world, the knower and his knowledge become as good as non-existent

Brahmaloka or the Satyaloka, the world of the lord Hiranya-garbha (the golden coloured resplendent Being), who is the support, the inner and the subtle Self, (the *liṅga-deha*) of the whole of the cosmos, and from there gets the direct vision of the highest Brahman, the Paramātmān or the Puruṣa, who is even beyond Hiranyagarbha. It is this third kind of meditator who, unlike the first two, gets what is known as 'gradual liberation' (*Krama-mukti*); he becomes one with the Parabrahma, along with the Hiranyagarbha.

The three parts of Aum which represent the three Vedas, as referred to above, are, however, amenable to the domination of death, if meditated upon severally. Yet, being connected with each other they can also be simultaneously meditated upon as constituting one syllable only, and as referring to the blissful Ātman alone. Then, there will be simultaneous knowledge of the three Puruṣas, namely, the Vaiśvānara who is the presiding deity of the gross body and of the wakeful condition; the Hiranyagarbha or the Puruṣa made up of light who is the lord of the subtle body (*liṅgadeha*) and the condition of dream; and the Īśvara or the Prājña who is the lord of dreamless sleep during which nothing is known in an articulate manner. Nay, the meditation on the three parts taken together, if done with the intention and faith that it is the meditation of the Parabrahma itself, will enable the meditator to realize that he is identical with it, and as such, enjoy the peace, the tranquility, the unperturbedness, the immortality and the fearlessness of the Brahman.

PRAŚNA SIXTH

Finally, came the turn of Sukeśa, the son of Bhāradvāja. He first told Pippalāda how a prince, named Hiranyanābha of the country Kosala, had approached him to enquire whether he had the knowledge of that Puruṣa who is said to possess sixteen parts (*kalās*); how he told the prince that he had no knowledge of that Puruṣa; how in order to convince him that he was speaking the truth, he told the prince that whosoever speaks the untruth would be dried up from the roots and would lose all that is valuable here on this earth and in the worlds beyond; and how afterwards the prince silently rode off in his chariot to his country. Bhārad-

vāja then requested the Guru to tell him as to where that Puruṣa could be found at all.

(It was already noticed in question 4 (6-9), that the entire world along with the soul is merged in the one imperishable Being during sound sleep. From this it follows that during the time of dissolution also, everything is merged back in the same imperishable Puruṣa, and that at the time of creation the whole of it must be springing forth anew, just as things forgotten in sleep are remembered after being awakened. Prāṇa also was mentioned as being produced out of the Ātman (Pra. 3.3); and in Pra. 4, 10, it was told that one who realizes this Ātman becomes omniscient and all-pervading. Hence, it was felt by Bhāradvāja that to have the knowledge of this Puruṣa was absolutely necessary.)

That Puruṣa dwells here in this very human body, said Pippalāda; here in the lotus-like region of the heart. And what are known as the sixteen parts are all wrongly imposed upon that unborn, imperishable and uncontaminable Puruṣa. Notwithstanding what the bewildered among men say that it is the Caitanya (Brahman) itself which appears in the various forms of jars and other things and is being destroyed every moment along with the destruction of the latter, or that the consciousness (Caitanya) itself is the property that emerges out of the combination of elements, we must remember what the Śruti tells us about the Brahman in different passages that it is the 'eternal Truth and knowledge' (Tai. 2.1, 1) 'it is knowledge and bliss' (Br. 3, 9, 28), and it remains steadfast in its own nature, though the things in which it is immanent might change in all possible ways, and might even perish. Existence and non-existence can both be predicated of things which are shortlived; but non-existence can never be predicated of the eternal knower. For, in the absence of the latter, the knowable world would never be the object of anyone's knowledge as it happens during sleep; but in the absence of the knowable world, the light of Caitanya which could have manifested it, might continue to shine. Even the upholder of the 'doctrine of momentariness' will not own that he has lost his eyesight, when he becomes unable to see and distinguish the things in darkness. Even his arbitrary opinion that along with the non-existence of the knowable world, the knower and his knowledge become as good as non-existent

cannot stand the test of reason unless it is assumed that the non-existence of knowledge and the knower is itself the result of another knower prior to him. If according to the nihilist too, non-existence is an object of knowledge and is also eternal, then knowledge and the knower also, according to his own hypothesis that they are identical with non-existence, would become eternal and of the nature of existence. His so-called non-existence as an entity will be only in name. Its real nature would be existence, and so, we do not lose anything if the eternal knower is called by a new name, namely non-existence.

The objector may say that it is not only a nominal non-existence of knowledge or the knower, but a real one, since in the absence of the knowable, no one gets the direct knowledge of the knower. But this is not correct; for, even the nihilist accepts the existence of knowledge during sleep. It is not at all necessary even to account for the distinction of the practical life to assume the independent existence of the knowable world over and above the self-conscious eternal knower. For, according to us, just as the one Sun appears as many on account of his being reflected in several portions of water, even so the eternal knower and his knowledge appear as many knowers and many pieces of knowledge, on account of the innumerable upādhis or limitations such as place, time, persons, situations, and names and forms in which He alone is eternally present. But in no case can the Puruṣa be hidden for ever by the human body which itself is the effect of the sixteen parts which arise from the Puruṣa. It cannot be said about him that he is hidden by the body in the same manner in which a mango hides in it the seed which is the cause of its cause, namely the tree. This, however, is not a good simile. For, whereas both the seed and the tree are made up of parts, the Puruṣa is partless, while the body is made up of parts. The words 'inside the body', which occur in the text, and which make us aware that the Puruṣa has to be discovered within one's own body, are not to be understood too literally, as if the Puruṣa is a berry-like entity which can be taken out of a vessel. They only mean that he is to be found out within the space in the heart. 1-2

Then the Puruṣa thought to himself, as to upon whose departure from the body, whether of Prāṇa or of any other kalā, he should depart, and upon whose presence in the body he should

also be present. This gives rise to the question as to who the real doer is. According to the Sāṅkhyas, it is the Pradhāna or the Prakṛti which alone becomes active in order to fulfil the twofold desire of the Puruṣa, namely to enjoy the sensuous experiences and to attain liberation. Therefore it is that the original equipoised condition of the three constituents of sattva, rāja, and tama, is disturbed, and it produces out of it the several evolutes like mahat (buddhi) and others. The Puruṣa, on the other hand, is said to be the inactive, passive enjoyer (bhoktā) of fruits. The Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas push up the argument by saying that when the infinite atoms are there to explain the creation of the universe, what need is there to suppose that God who is alone, without any limbs or instruments is the creator? And if he is the conscious God, how would he create a world which is full of misery? So, on the whole, it might appear satisfactory to say that God is the doer even though he is not, just as the servant is said to be the doer, even though he does it at the behest of the king.

But all these arguments hold no water. In the first place, there is no fundamental difference between one being a bhoktā and another being a Kartā; for whether one does something or is busy in having some experience, he is equally active. So, to make the distinction between the Puruṣa and the Prakṛti, one of them as bhoktā and the other as Kartā, is simply to create an artificial difference, and would therefore serve no purpose. In the non-dual experience of the Brahman, excepting apparently only for the purpose of the scriptures which expound the nature and the way to secure liberation from bondage, there is no scope for any such things as activity, means of activity, fruits or for the enjoyers and the doers. The Brahman merely appears to be active; even so, he merely appears to be affected by the upādhis of the emotional changes, even though he is not so in reality. In short, the Brahman or the Puruṣa is neither transformed in what it is not nor is affected by the changing circumstances by distinctions and differences. It is the upādhis which are known as kalās which make him appear as kartā and bhoktā.

The Puruṣa then first of all created Prāṇa; for, Prāṇa it is who is the inner Self of all the beings in the universe, and the very support of the organs of sense and action of them all. He

then produced faith (śraddhā) out of prāṇa, so that all the people in the world should be induced by it to do good actions. And then, in order that the body must be able enough to experience the fruits of actions, he produced the five elements as the material out of which the body was formed. First, he produced the element or space (ākāśa) with its specific quality of sound; then, out of ākāśa the wind, with its specific quality of touch in addition to the quality of sound, because of its being a product of ākāśa; then out of wind, the element of fire with the specific quality of form, and along with it the two inherited qualities of sound and touch; then again, out of fire, the element of water with its specific quality of flavour, along with the three earlier qualities of sound, touch and form; and finally, out of water, the element of earth and its specific quality of smell, along with the four qualities of the preceding elements, namely, sound, touch, form, and flavour. And further, again, in order to make possible the acquisition of knowledge, and the doing of actions, he brought into being out of the elements and their qualities, the five senses of knowledge, as also the five organs of actions. And, in order that all this should be owned and possessed by a master, as if, he produced the inner sense or the mind. Feeling then the necessity of keeping the organism alive, he produced food in the form of rice and barley. Out of this came the physical and the mental energy which made the people active as well as inclined to practise penance for the purpose of purifying themselves. The guidance in this matter as well as in the performance of sacrifices was provided by the creation of the four Vedas. Naturally, worlds which would be suitable to live according to the quality of the actions done in this world, were also created by him; and so, finally, names like Devadatta, etc., were invented by him, so that distinction can be made between one individual and another.

Notwithstanding the creation of all these sixteen (products) (kalās) out of himself, the entire world consisting of these parts is ultimately dissolved in the Puruṣa himself. And just as the rivers which run into the sea lose their names and forms, and there remains one sea only, even so all these sixteen kalās have no other destination except the Puruṣa, the only one omniscient Being in whom they all merge and lose their names and forms. What then remains is the eternal, immortal, kalā-less, Puruṣa,

the Brahman. Know ye therefore, O my disciples, this *Puruṣa* in whom all the sixteen *kalās* are fixed as if they are the spokes fixed in the hub of a wheel. He is the only object fit to be realized; for, then only Death can do you no harm. This much only I know about that highest Brahman, said Pippalāda, and that there remains nothing else to be known or realized.

Upon this, the six ṛṣis, Kātyāyana and others, rose from their seats and after worshipping and prostrating before Pippalāda, said to him that he was their spiritual father, inasmuch as it was he who made them reborn as embodied Brahman by imparting unto them the *Brahma-vidyā* and thereby leading them safe to the other end of the ocean of *avidyā* (*māyā*). Saying so, they all saluted that great sage again and over again.

Retrospect

Kātyāyana and other five sages approached the great Sage Pippalāda with the desire to obtain the knowledge of the Brahman. Kātyāyana asked him about the manner in which the creatures of the world were born. Pippalāda replied that Prajāpati produced first of all the pair of Rayi and Prāṇa, meaning thereby the entire wealth of enjoyable objects and the enjoyer respectively, and then explained how with these two passive and active principles, Prajāpati could produce all the things in the world. But what Kātyāyana could achieve after all was nothing but the knowledge of the aparā vidyā whose scope is determined by karma and upāsana only, but which can never make the man free from births and the consequent misery. Bhārgava went a step further and asked Pippalāda as to what it was which supports the entire physical world. Pippalāda replied that it was the subtle element of Prāṇa which has the power of not only supporting the five physical elements, but the senses also. All the beings, said he, are fixed in Prāṇa, as the spokes are fixed in the navel of a wheel. The same question regarding prāṇa is carried on by Kausalya and Pippalāda tells him in reply that Prāṇa is originated from the Ātman and that after entering into the body it supports them all by dividing itself into five parts known as prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, samāna, and udāna. Corresponding to this fivefold division of prāṇa in the individual, there is, says Pippalāda, similar division of it in the whole of the universe also; but whereas the first proceeds from the Ātman, the second proceeds from the Prajāpati. Pippalāda next says with reference to the question of Sauryaṇi Gārgya, that though during the condition of sleep, the senses become inactive, and though as a consequence of this, man does not see or hear, etc., Prāṇa remains awake, and the mind being merged in the Puruṣa enjoys happiness. Besides, says Pippalāda, the mind acts freely in dreams, and creates and recreates by imagination what might have been seen or not seen.

Pippalāda strikes however a separate note altogether when he speaks in reply to Śaibya Satyakāma that the union of the individual soul with God or the Brahman is not possible unless man meditates on Om as the Name of God. But the moment man perceives the supreme Being, he becomes free from fear,

disease, and death. And, finally, when Śukesin Bhāradvāja asked him about the 'Puruṣa with the sixteen parts' (kalās), Pippalāda replied that the Puruṣa (soul) who is composed of the five physical elements of earth, water, etc., and of mind, prāṇa, faith, penance, sacrifice, etc., becomes finally merged and united with the infinite, lustrous God, just as a river becomes one with the ocean, and loses its very name and form.

6

Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad

Introduction

The Veda as a whole has got two wings, karma-kāṇḍa and Jñānakāṇḍa. The followers of karma-kāṇḍa wish to fulfil their various desires either during their life-time on this very earth, or in some other region such as heaven after death; while those who follow the Jñāna-kāṇḍa wish to be free from all such desires, actions, and the fruits thereof, inasmuch as they are keen to discern the hollowness and the perishable nature of them all. A sort of disgust (Vairāgya) for the whole of saṁsāra, which includes in it all the pleasures, the glory and the power of all the divinities, including even Indra and Prajāpati, seizes their minds, and they become anxious to know and realize the Brahman. It was therefore with the view to making known the secret of the Brahma-vidyā, and the internal and external means of realizing the Brahman, that this voluminous Upaniṣad was, as its very name suggests, composed in a forest.

So far as the needs of the empirical, practical life are concerned, we have the four means of arriving at the truth, namely, the sensuous perception, inference, comparison, and testimony of someone who knows. Corresponding to these there are instruments of knowledge which are useful in knowing the nature of the Real which however, is altogether beyond the scope of the phenomenal knowledge. Perception, there will be, but it will be non-sensuous in character. Inference also will there be, but it will be always subservient to what is thus spiritually or intuitively perceived and so will not go beyond it; comparison will make us aware of how to eliminate the false and the unreal, and to concentrate our attention on what is true and real; so far as the verbal testimony is concerned, it will be not of any random passer-by, but of the expert and the wise who have actually lived the Brahmanic life and have experienced the joy and the peace of it. The existence of the Ātman need not therefore be an assumption only in order to safeguard the pleasures in the worlds beyond. It is, so far as the realizers of Brahman are concerned, a concrete matter of direct and immediate experience, just as

the heat and light of the Sun or fire are. Without any sojourns to the worlds beyond for which penances, sacrifices, and charity must be performed, the realization of Brahman can be had within the life-time of anyone, whether he is a god, a man, or a demon, provided he sits at the feet of a realized person, serves him, leads a morally virtuous life, and does according to his instructions with complete surrender, faith, and intelligence. In other words the statement that liberation or mokṣa means the realization of the Ātman is not merely the statement of an unverifiable state which is quite different from the waking, the dreaming, and the sleeping states, but, on the contrary, of a verifiable fact for him who is prepared to make the experiment for himself by starting with an initial faith in Guru, and initial Vairāgya for the perishable things of the world, and an initial courage and strength of will to undergo daily the ethico-spiritual discipline, for a very long time. Man combines in him both the divine and the demoniac heritages; it will be necessary for him to part with the latter and develop the former day by day. It was probably with this intention that Prajāpati gave the same instruction by uttering the letter 'da' equally to the gods, the men, and the demons. What was meant for the gods and the demons was also meant for man. He must acquire the virtue of self-control, which was the advice given to gods; he must be free from cruelty and have compassion, which was the advice given to the demons; and because man is greedy by nature, he was asked by Prajāpati to forsake the greed by going beyond all desires, especially those that pertain to wealth, progeny and fame.

Then comes the law of Karma which is said to be inexorably binding on all. One must reap as he sows some time or other in this or in the lives to come. A portion of the karma may begin to fructify and form the Prārabdha of the present life, while the fruits of the remaining portion of karma may lie in waiting. These go to form what is known as the 'Saṁcita' or the accumulated stock of the fruits which must be enjoyed in some future life. The third variety of karma, known as the Kriyamāṇa, is that which is being done throughout one's life, and is being added so far as its fruits are concerned to the already existing Saṁcita. There are, besides, the Nitya (routine) and the Naimittika (occasional) karmas, like sandhyā, Agnihotra and the

performance of sacrifices which are ultimately rooted in desires. All of them can therefore be called as Kāmya-karmas. In the case of the realized person, however, there being no desires except that of being lodged in the Ātman, actions will be done without there being any selfish motive of having any fruits of them. They will simply be the expression of his duties determined for him, by the society or state, or by the will of God. But they will all be benevolent, morally virtuous, altruistic, and subservient to the attainment to spiritual Good. Such works will certainly be useful for the emergence of Ātmajñāna. But the moment the Ātman is seen, the fire of that knowledge is such as will burn in that very moment both the Sañcita and the Kriyamāṇa; and so far as the Prārabdha is concerned, one has only to wait till the fall of the body inasmuch as the body itself is the result of some previous karma. But this is not finally true; for the presence of the body is no hindrance in the way of realizing the Ātman. It is just there along with all the senses and their functions; but in the mind of the realized person, there remains no consciousness of his being identical with the body or the senses. Much less there is in him the consciousness of his being the doer (kartā) of actions or the enjoyer (bhoktā) of the fruits of actions. He enjoys the state of being liberated even while he is living. Being a jīvanmukta, in other words, he enjoys at the same time the condition of being a videha-mukta. The word 'Videha' need not mean 'the fall of the body' only; it may mean the condition of being identified with Brahman without the consciousness of body. Like Yājñavalkya, he would not mind carrying away the cows and the gold coins tied to their horns from the palace of Janaka, if the occasion demands; but he will never be contaminated by desires, actions, and their fruits, because to become absorbed in the contemplation of the Ātman means during that condition the cessation of any other sensuous activity, mental imaginings, egotistic feelings, and attachment to any other worldly object or person. The knowledge of Brahman, that is, the illuminational kind of the realization of the Brahman involves in it the Vairāgya or disgust for all other objects as well as the devotional absorption in Brahman. The real kind of Jñāna is not therefore possible without the devotional union with God and the consequent renunciation or Sannyāsa of everything else. Devotion to Guru as to God, Vairāgya and sannyāsa go

together and make a perfect, indivisible whole. No Vairāgya and renunciation (sannyāsa) are worth the name, unless they are supported by the Brahma-jñāna, and reciprocally, no devotion and the realization of oneness with Brahman are genuine unless they are backed up by desirelessness and the spirit of renunciation. Devotion culminates in jñāna which, in its turn, culminates in Vairāgya and which in its turn, leads to sannyāsa. Likewise Sannyāsa also which becomes the preparatory ground for devotion, stabilizes both Jñāna and Vairāgya.

And when these three ingredients of Brahma-jñāna are there, there is bound to be the fourth as being inseparable from the three. That element is the Ānanda (bliss) of Brahman. It is altogether different in kind from the so-called innumerable, sensuous ānandas or pleasures available here on this earth or in all the worlds beyond. And, if the knower of Brahman is not different from the Brahman, a corollary can be drawn according to which we can say that the locus of the knowledge and of the bliss of Brahman lies in the knower of the Brahman himself. But on this account it should not be said that the knowledge and the joy are subjective only. For, there being only one Caitanya or Pure Consciousness, they are at the same time objective also. Or rather, it is on account of them that no distinction can be made between the knower of Brahman (the Guru) and the Brahman itself. Here, the epistemological experience of an aspirant is the guarantee of the metaphysical truth that the Brahman alone is Real.

What then are the characteristics of this Ātman or Brahman whom the Upaniṣad tells us to realize? We can do no better than to quote what the great sage Yājñavalkya has told us on four occasions in the course of the Upaniṣad itself. He teaches us, as Professor Ranade summarises, '(1) that all objects are centred in the self; (2) that like salt in water the Ātman is all-pervading and immanent; (3) that as all things exist for the Ātman, He alone ought to be considered as the dearest of all, and all things dear for the sake of the Ātman; (4) that the Ātman alone is real; all else a mere show; (5) that He is neither large nor small, neither short nor long; that he is flavourless, eyeless, odourless, and qualityless; (6) that He is the 'bund' (Setu) of all existence, our very hours and days are measured by the Ātman; (7) that He is the inner controller of all, the great thread-puller; (8) that

He is the ultimate light of all, the cause of Self-consciousness; all other lights are lights by way of courtesy; (9) that He is the ultimate seer, hearer, thinker; there is no thinker besides him; (10) that He perceives himself, there being no other perception or thought; (11) that He only seems to move or think; there being no migration for him; (12) that at the time of death; the *prāṇas* of the realized person do not migrate; they become merged in him, and so there is no return for him.'

Now, as said above, if the *Ātman* does not migrate, can it be said that he enters into all created objects? No, we cannot say so, since all talk about such entrance is only metaphorical. When the various accounts about creation are only for the purpose of drawing our attention from the effect to the cause, from the superimposed appearances of names and forms to the nameless and formless Reality of Brahman alone, creation and entrance for that purpose have no abiding value. Naturally, the entire glory of *Prajāpati*, his assuming the form of a horse, and his act of sacrificing that horse, that is, the performance of the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice which is described at length even at the beginning of the Upaniṣad, is nothing but Death only. What is deathless, or the Death of death is the Brahman, and that can be achieved by consciously working out the dissolution of all desires, actions and the fruits thereof in the contemplation of the *Ātman*, in seeing Him face to face, and thereby transcending all kinds of *upāsanās*, *kāma* and *karma*, born out of the ignorance of the Real.

Preview

Adhyāya First

1. The Benedictory verse.

Brāhmaṇa First

2. Introduction by Śaṅkarācārya.
3. The metaphorical description of the universe as a sacrificial horse.

Brāhmaṇa Second

4. Originally there was nothing except Death.
5. Negation implies affirmation.
6. Refutation of the Buddhistic view.
7. Effect exists prior to its origination.
8. Four varieties of non-existence.
9. Death, the Progenitor and the all-devouring Prajāpati.
10. Prajāpati becomes the sacrificial horse.

Brāhmaṇa Third

11. The divine *versus* the demoniac heritage.
12. The power of the upāsana on the Chief Prāṇa.
13. The utility of a symbol.
14. Comparison of Karma-kāṇḍa with jñāna-Kāṇḍa.
15. Knowledge is the import of the prohibitory actions also.
16. The demons pierced the gods with evil.
17. But the Chief Prāṇa could not be pierced with evil.
18. Worship of the Chief Prāṇa results in the attainment of Divinity.
19. Prāṇa as the essence and the support of the body.
20. Prāṇa, the same as Udgitha.

Brāhmaṇa Fourth

21. Prajāpati creates by dividing himself in two halves.
22. Various opinions about the nature of Prajāpati.

23. Brahman as immanent and transcendent.
24. Wrong views of the Logicians and others.
25. The entrance of the Ātman is metaphorical.
26. Realization of the Ātman arrests activity.
27. The validity of the Vedānta lies within itself.
28. To realize the Ātman is to see Him in one's own Form.
29. Wrong views of the Vṛttikāras and Bhartṛprapañca about the nature of Brahman.
30. The Pūrvapakṣa again.
31. Refutation of the Pūrvapakṣa.
32. Brahman as the eternal Seer of himself.
33. Even gods cannot bring obstacles in the way of those who seek to realize the Brahman.
34. Brahma-jñāna destroys the Sañcita Karma, though not the Prārabdha.
35. Gods are jealous of the realizer of the Brahman.
36. The creation of four Varṇas (castes).
37. The realizer of the Ātman will never grieve.
38. The three eṣanās (desires) and the fivefold sacrifice sum up the whole of Śaṁsāra.

Brāhmaṇa Fifth

39. To eat food without giving it to others is to eat sin.
40. Speech, Mind and Prāṇa, considered as food.
41. The three foods constitute the perishable world of Prajāpati.
42. To attain immortality, be in the company of Prāṇa and Vāyu.

Brāhmaṇa Sixth

43. Turn away from the perishable names, forms and actions, which make up the Śaṁsāra.
44. Ultimately, Prāṇa also is not the Ātman.

Adhyaya Second

Brāhmaṇa First

45. The Ātman as the subject-matter of Vidyā.
46. The proud Gārgya describes several Puruṣas.

47. Unlike Prāṇa, the Ātman is both conscious and bhoktā (enjoyer).
48. Objections against the incapacity of Prāṇa, considered.
49. Vijñānamaya means pure Self-consciousness.
50. The Ātman is different from the dreaming and the wakeful consciousness.
51. The world as emanation from the Ātman.
52. The saṁsārī jīva and the non-saṁsārī Brahman.
53. Ultimately, the jīva is non-different from the Brahman.
54. Flawless is the Vedāntic position.
55. The parable of the deserted prince.
56. Valid is karma-kāṇḍa for the ignorant, and valid the Jñānākāṇḍa for the wise.
57. Upaniṣadic instruction is necessary before the realization of the Brahman.

Brāhmaṇa Second

58. Prāṇa compared to a child, and the man's head to an inverted pot.

Brāhmaṇa Third

59. The manifest and the unmanifest are the two aspects of the Brahman.
60. Examination of different views about the Puruṣa.

Brāhmaṇa Fourth

61. Sannyāsa is only a preparation to realize the Brahman.
62. Women also can realize the Brahman.
63. The Ātman alone ought to be the dearest of all.
64. An unconscious reference to the Self is involved in all knowledge.
65. Dissolution of all things in Brahman must be consciously worked out.

Brāhmaṇa Fifth

66. Everything is the Madhu of everything else.

67. The realizer of Brahman becomes the Self of all.
68. To love the Ātman is to love all beings.
69. The realizer of Brahma-vidyā will not be affected by karma.
70. The Ātman is the prototype of everything.

Adhyāya Third

Brāhmaṇa First

71. The way in which the sacrificer goes beyond death, and ascends to heaven.

Brāhmaṇa Second

72. Prāṇa, speech, karma, upāsana and Hiraṇyagarbha are all bound by death.
73. Vidyā and Avidyā can never be combined.
74. Grahas and the Atigrahas.
75. Brahman, the Death of death.
76. Prāṇas of the realized person merge in Brahman at the time of death.

Brāhmaṇa Third

77. Jñāna removes ignorance of Reality, karma does not; even if it is combined with upāsana.
78. An Ātmayājī is better than a Devayājī.

Brāhmaṇa Fourth

79. The sight of the Ātman is neither produced nor destroyed.

Brāhmaṇa Fifth

80. The Uṣaṣṭa and the kahola Brāhmaṇas aim at two different things.
81. The real sannyāsa is one which is supported by Ātmajñāna.
82. Vairāgya and Ātmajñāna are dependent on each other.

Brāhmaṇa Sixth

83. Gārgi becomes silent due to fear of death.

Brāhmaṇa Seventh

84. Vāyu is the Sūtrātmā, and the Antarātman or the inner self of all.

Brāhmaṇa Eighth

85. Gārgi being pleased salutes Yājñavalkya.
 86. The Akṣara Brahma is Upādhiless, uncontaminated and directly visible.
 87. Categories of substance and quality are inapplicable to the Brahman.
 88. One who realizes the Brahman is a Brāhmin.

Brāhmaṇa Ninth

89. The maximum and the minimum number of gods.
 90. The divinities as located in the Self of Yājñavalkya.

Adhyāya Fourth*Brāhmaṇa First and Second*

91. Vāk, Prāṇa, ear, eye, mind and the heart can be worshiped as merely the aspects of the Brahman.
 92. Leaving his pride as a king, Janaka approaches Yājñavalkya with the humility of a disciple.
 93. The Ātman as Vaiśvānara, Taijasa and Prājña.

Brāhmaṇa Third

94. The Ātman is the Light of all other lights.
 95. Materialists and Naturalists argue that the Ātmajyoti is physical in nature.
 96. The Vedantin views the Ātmajyoti as both internal and non-sensuous.

97. The Vijñānamaya Ātman is different from both buddhi and jīva.
98. A series of illusions due to the ignorance of the Ātman.
99. The Ātman does not migrate.
100. Objections of the Buddhist schools.
101. Refutation of the objections.
102. Knowledge of the continual existence of a thing is necessary for recognition.
103. The real nature of the Ātman can be discovered in the dreaming consciousness.
104. The extraordinary power of the Ātman to do and move as He likes.
105. The Ātman is free, uncontaminated and immortal.
106. Mokṣa means the removal of avidyā by Ātma-vidyā.
107. During sleep, avidyā is not rooted out; it remains simply dormant.
108. The sight of the Seer is not different from the Seer.
109. Like ākāśa the Ātman is one and partless.
110. The supreme Brahmanānda is on the top of all other kinds of ānanda.
111. The jīva travels along with the Lingadeha to a new body.

Brāhmaṇa Fourth

112. At the time of death, the Lingadeha departs through the eye, the ear or any other region.
113. Vidyā, karma and vāsanā (desire) follow the departed soul.
114. Opinions regarding transmigration.
115. Vāsanā creates a new subtle body which then grows into a gross one.
116. The Ātman becomes Vijñānamaya, Manomaya, Prāṇamaya, Caṅkṣurmaya etc.
117. But the most fundamental cause of saṁsāra is the ignorance of Reality.
118. Liberation means the realization of the Ātman, even while one is living, or after death.
119. The locus of the knowledge and of joy of the Ātman, is the Ātman itself.
120. The prāṇas of the liberated merge in Brahman.

121. Ways like Devayāna and Pitṛyāna and notions of Puṇya and Pāpa refer to saṁsāra only.
122. Reserved are the dark worlds for the ignorant, while bliss and fearlessness are for the realizers of the Ātman.
123. The spiritual teacher can mould the mind of the disciple.
124. Constant meditation will remove false appearances.
125. Being the Lord of Karma, the Brahman is not affected by good or bad deeds.
126. Even so, one who contemplates on the Ātman renounces everything else.
127. Sannyāsa is recommended for achieving and stabilizing Ātmajñāna.
128. The realized person sees everywhere nothing but the presence of the Ātman.

Brāhmaṇa Fifth

129. Karma alone or its combination with the knowledge is useful prior to the realization of the Ātmajñāna.
130. Good and benevolent works as well as moral virtues are highly useful for the emergence of the Ātma-jñāna.
131. Let the counsel of doing works for a hundred years be reserved for the ignorant people.

Adhyāya Fifth

Brāhmaṇas First to Sixth

132. Brahman will be one only in spite of manyness.
133. One's own experience is the most trustworthy of all.
134. Prajāpati's instruction to gods, men and asuras.
135. Worship of the heart as the Brahman.
136. The Puruṣa in the eye is the same as the Puruṣa in the Sun.
137. Brahman as of the size of a grain of wheat.
138. Brahman to be worshipped as Vāk, lightning, Vaiśvānara and Vāyu.

Brāhmaṇas Seventh to Fifteenth

139. Contemplation on misery, disease and death.

140. Worship of Prāṇa in its different aspects.

141. Comparison of Gāyatrī and Sāvitrī.

Adhyāya Sixth

142. Dispute among the prāṇas; the Chief Prāṇa as the best and the eldest.

Adhyāya First**1. *The benedictory verse***

Om, that (which was before the creation) was the Brahman in its entirety; that (which is after the creation, as endowed with names and forms) is (the same old) entire Brahman (though it appears as different and independent); and what exists in the soul of a realized person is again (the same old causal) Brahman in its entirety (and not the names and forms, nor the individual soul).

ADHYĀYA FIRST: BRĀHMAṆA FIRST**2. *Introduction by Śaṅkarācārya***

This Upaniṣad is known as 'bṛhat' because it is the most voluminous of all; and as it was studied in the forest (araṇya) it is known as 'āraṇyaka' also. It forms the Vājasaneyā-Bṛāhmaṇa portion of the Kāṇva branch of the Yajurveda. Because it contains the Brahma-vidyā which, if resorted to, destroys root and branch, the whole of the show of the phenomenal world, it is known as Upa-ni-ṣad (since the verb 'Ṣad' with the prefixes of 'Upa' and 'ni' means to destroy this show).

Now, in the first place, we shall determine the nature of the relation which exists between this Upaniṣad and that portion of the Vedas which deals with Karma or works and is therefore known as Karma-Kāṇḍa. It is common knowledge that all people wish to get their desires fulfilled and to avoid what they do not like, and that so far as these objects of desire are the tangible, perceivable facts of the empirical, practical life, the means which are adopted by the people in order to achieve their objects or to avert what they do not want, are also either perceivable by the senses or inferable by the intellect. But this is not always the case. There will be certain actions whose fruits would be available in some future life. But to believe in this will be possible only on the hypothesis that the Atman lives beyond death, and that there is the transmigration of the soul. What

should be one's desires in a life beyond death and what should not, and what should be the appropriate means of obtaining the desirable and avoiding the undesirable, are matters which seem to have no meaning from the viewpoint of the Lokāyatikas and the Bauddhas who do not believe in the existence of the Ātman at all. So, what the Vedic instruction wants to achieve through this, and other Upaniṣads is to create the belief first in the existence of the Ātman who can never be the object of sensuous perception or of inference, and then to tell us as to what kind of works should be done and what ought not to be done so that they would be useful in making the knowledge of the Ātman possible.

That the Ātman is different from the body is told in several passages of the Upaniṣads. For instance we read in the Kaṭho-paniṣad (2, 2, 6-7) that after death the soul gets a new body according to the nature of the works which he might have done while living, and that the existence of the Ātman should be taken for granted. Similarly, in this very Upaniṣad, we shall be told later on that the Ātman is of the nature of intuitive experience and that he is self-effulgent (Br. 2, 1, 16; 4, 3, 9). This does not mean that the Ātman can ever be sensuously perceived. For, no one who sees a jar can doubt its existence, and no one who would very closely look at a pillar would mistake it for a man, yet the nihilist can afford to say, notwithstanding his own personal feeling of the existence of 'I' or of his personal identity, that the Ātman does not exist. Nor can it be said that the existence of the Ātman can be definitely proved by inference. For, though the Śruti has provided the sign, namely, the functioning of prāṇa, on the strength of which one can infer the existence of the Ātman, the Mīmāṃsakas and the Naiyāyikas, who have the feeling of personal identity as also the respect for the Śruti which has mentioned the above-mentioned sign, declare that both these are the ramifications of our own intellect, and that therefore the existence of the Ātman is a matter which is to be determined by sensuous perception or inference.

So far as the Karma-kāṇḍa, that is, that portion of the Vedas which deals with Karma (Works) is concerned, it is meant for those who believe in the continued existence of the Ātman beyond death; but this is not because they are interested so much in the knowledge of the Ātman, as in knowing the ways and means of acquiring what they desire and in avoiding what they

do not. But the Karma-kāṇḍa has not tried to dispel the ignorance about the Ātman or Brahman, on account of which alone the doer of works becomes bound by the egoism that he is the doer of them and the enjoyer of their fruits. Naturally, so long as this ignorance is not removed, the soul is moved by the emotions of hate and love which arise as the result of the fruits of actions, and is goaded by its selfish desires to do even such actions as go beyond the injunctions and prohibitions. When the mind, speech, and body become polluted by evil actions, the soul descends to the lowest level of beings, such as plants or stones. As against this, when the soul resorts to good and pious actions, it rises higher and higher from the domain of the Fathers to that of the gods, and from that to the Brahmaloḥa. This depends, however, on the fact whether the soul is interested in doing such actions only as are commended by the Dharma-śāstra but are bereft of knowledge, or in doing such actions as are combined with knowledge and which therefore constitute what is known as Upāsana. All the same, whether it is the domain of actions only or of actions combined with the knowledge of the various deities, it refers to the Pravṛtti side of Dharma. This is the limit of the saṁsāra as caused by Avidyā or ignorance. It looks like a stream which has neither any beginning nor any end; but it has in it the seeds of the ruin of the soul, inasmuch as it consists of the evanescent names, forms, actions and their fruits, and appears as real on account of its being superimposed upon the Brahman. Therefore, in order to dissuade the persons who have become somewhat disgusted with the transient show of the affairs of the world from being tempted again with the same show of avidyā, and to instruct them how to acquire the knowledge of Brahman, the Upaniṣad commences to tell us regarding the sacrifice known as Aśvamedha.

The only motive in describing this sacrifice in detail even at the beginning of the Upaniṣad is gradually to turn away the mind of the sacrificer first from the mere act of performing it to the knowledge of the devotional worship of Prajāpati, the supreme deity of the sacrifice, and then to the knowledge of the only Reality, known as the Brahman. It will not be correct to say that the description of the sacrifice is confined only to the way in which it is to be performed. For it is told that one who sacrifices, as well as one who knows the meaning of it goes beyond sin. Both

of them will attain the domain of Prajāpati or Hiranyagarbha, who, however, is described by the Upaniṣad as Death in the form of hunger or desire. In short, even the attainment of Hiranyagarbha falls within the sphere of the perishable saṃsāra which in the last analysis, means the pleasures obtainable from woman, son, etc., or from actions which lead the soul after death to the worlds of the Fathers or gods (Br. 1.4.17;). In other words, the purpose of the description of the Aśvamedha sacrifice is to show that this life of the world is governed by three things only, namely, forms, names, and actions, though they were unmanifest before the creation of the world. They are the seeds out of which this saṃsāra has become manifest as a huge tree, and, like the serpent on a rope, has created the illusion that it alone is real and not the Ātman or Brahman on which it is superimposed. What the Upaniṣad wants therefore to teach us is that the Brahma-vidyā is altogether different from this all.

3. *The metaphorical description of the universe as a sacrificial horse*

The sacrifice is known as Aśvamedha, because the animal to be sacrificed is 'aśva', meaning a horse. Prajāpati is the presiding deity in this sacrifice. The dawn is considered as the best period for meditation, and is therefore called as the head of the horse, that being the most important part of the body. The Sun comes after the dawn; therefore he is considered as the eyes of the horse, which are seen after the head is seen. Wind is the vital breath; fire is the open mouth of the horse, for fire is the presiding deity of the mouth. The year, i.e. time and seasons, are the body; heaven is its back; space, the stomach; earth, the resting place; the four chief quarters and the four mid-quarters are respectively sides and the bones of the horse; the months are the joints; days and nights are its feet; on account of whiteness the stars are said to be its bones; clouds are the flesh which trickle the rain of blood contained in it; sands are the half-digested food; rivers are the veins which flow towards the anus; mountains are its liver and spleen; plants and shrubs, the hair on its body, the ascending and the descending Sun, its two parts from the navel to the head, and to its hips; the shining of the lightning is its yawning, and the stretching of its limbs in order to relax; the thunder of

clouds is the shaking of its body; and speech is its neighing.

There arose in front of the horse the day caused by Sun as coming out of the eastern sea; and behind the horse there followed the night which came out of the western sea (in which the Sun had set). Therefore the day and the night are as if, the two pots of gold and silver which are kept before and after this important sacrificial horse. And, as the horse is itself the Prajāpati, it has itself not only the capacity to attain to Godhood, but it can also carry gods, Gandharvas, Asuras and men to that status, by becoming their carrier under different epithets, namely, 'haya, Vāji, arva and aśva', respectively.

(Here ends the first Brāhmaṇa of the first Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIRST: BRĀHMAṆA SECOND

4. *Original 'Nothing' identified with Death and Hunger*

Now begins the description of the origin of the sacrificial fire. In the beginning there was nothing in this universe. All this was covered by death. It was covered by hunger which itself is Death. He resolved, 'let me be endowed with mind.' While he was worshipping, there arose water. He thought, 'if while I am worshipping, water (happiness) has been produced, it is then the essence of fire (arka). Whoever thus knows this essence will definitely obtain happiness. |

5. *Negation implies affirmation*

In the beginning there was nothing in this universe except mind; nothing that can be said to have a name and a form. This need not be considered as amounting to Void, as there is neither cause nor effect. For, there can never be the non-existence of the cause. The jar may not exist as an effect; but there exists the lump of earth as its cause. Therefore the statement, 'there was nothing, etc.' does not imply a negation which means a Void. It is not on a par with the statement, 'the son of a barren woman is adorned by the flowers of the sky, 'where both the subject and the

predicate terms have no existence at all. The statement 'there was nothing, etc.' implies a negation which is only relative with something else which exists; it is a negation which affirms something, a negation only in name. The Śruti passage is specific in saying in a roundabout way, no doubt, that what is called as 'nothing' is Death or Hunger which covers something; and what is called as 'all this' means the effect, that is, something which is covered. In other words, it definitely states that both the cause and the effect were existing before the effect became manifest.

We can have the support of inference also in this respect. A jar is produced out of earth, and an ornament out of gold. It is not, however, necessary that the earth or gold should also have some definite form, because the jar or the ornament has a form. For, the potter or the goldsmith can give any form he would like to give to the jar or the ornament, because the earth or gold has the capacity to be transformed into any form. So, when the Śruti says that 'there was nothing in the beginning', what it means is that the cause of the world did not possess any particular form or name. One cannot argue that because the lump of earth is exhausted before the emergence of the jar, therefore the earth, as the cause of the jar becomes non-existent. The existence of the earth as the cause continues to exist in its effect, namely, the jar, exactly in the same manner as it continued to exist in the lump of the earth even before the latter was made into the jar. The same particles of earth which had entered into the lump to make it so, can be seen as constituting the jar also. One need not therefore suppose that it might be the similarity between the earth and the lump of the earth which makes us believe falsely that the earth is the cause of the jar.

6. *Refutation of the Buddhist view*

Even upon the hypothesis that it is the similarity between two things which makes us falsely believe that it is the continued existence of one and the same thing, recognition of a thing that it is the same which appeared in an earlier moment of time will not be possible on the Buddhistic view that everything has a momentary existence, and that no consciousness of mind (as endorsed by intellect) is valid by itself. This means that the consciousness of 'this' and that of 'that', in the statement which represents

the recognition, namely, 'this is that', have each one of them, got a momentary existence. As such, there cannot be continued existence of the 'that' of the earlier moment, so that it should appear as the 'this' of the next moment. The 'that' will have no connection with the 'this', and there will be no recognition unless, contrary to his hypothesis, the Buddhist maintains that there is the continued existence of one and the same human being during the two moments of time, and that he apprehends by means of memory and perception that the 'this' of the present time is the continuation of the 'that' in the past. If the Buddhist is averse to accept the existence of a permanent witness, his belief in the doctrine of momentariness will also be momentary in character; or that the two consciousnesses of 'that' and 'this' which he thinks as being similar, will be valid by themselves – a view which is contrary to his basic belief that nothing is valid by itself, and which will therefore create a *regress ad infinitum* for him.

Besides, to be aware of similarity between two things is to become aware at the same time that the two things are dissimilar in other respects. And if there is no similarity in the least how can there be recognition at all? And then, in the absence of similarity, of recognition, as also of the permanent witness as the recognizer, who can pronounce that there are either real things or unreal illusions? Even to say that there is void or illusion simply, there must be some one who is neither illusory nor of the nature of Void. Therefore, the Upanisadic passage we are considering asserts that prior to the creation of the world, the cause exists as the Reality.

7. *Effect exists prior to its origination*

We come to posit another great truth enshrined in the above-mentioned Śruti passage, namely, that the effect also exists prior to its being created. That it becomes manifest at some time is itself the reason why we say that it does exist prior to its origination. As the jar which remains invisible on account of its covered by darkness, becomes visible the moment the darkness is removed by light, even so, we infer that the world which is now manifest must have existed before its creation, even though it might not have been manifest then. A jar which does not exist

does not become visible even though there is the light of the Sun. In like manner, had not the world existed in some form prior to its creation, it would never have become manifest. We have note, however, that words like creation and destruction, existence and non-existence, have no other meaning except that of manifestation and non-manifestation, which occur on account of the effect being covered or not by something else. The jar which is not manifest is so, either because there is darkness or a wall to prevent its being visible, or because it still lies in its earlier condition of a lump of earth in which the particles of earth are inherent. In the first case, the jar must be actually there in order that it could be made visible by the destruction of the darkness by the help of a lamp, or by breaking the wall which prevented the jar from being visible. Otherwise, in the prior non-existence of the jar, mere removal of the darkness, or the breaking of the wall would be of no avail except providing us with light or with more space. In the second case, on the other hand, the jar though not actual, must be considered as potentially existing in the lump of the earth. The usual way of speaking is that the earth is the cause and the jar is the effect. But, as there intervenes the lump of the earth between the cause and the effect, it acts as an hindrance for the manifestation of the next effect, namely, the jar. And, even if the hindrance is removed, that is, if the lump is pounded back into the earth, there will be no manifestation of the jar. What is required then for the manifestation of the effect out of the cause is the employment of other necessary agents, such as a doer, the means, the instruments and the right sort of activity, and not merely the removal of the hindrance. Over and above the earth and the lump made out of it, there must be, in other words, a potter, a wheel, a stick to make it revolve, and the activity of the potter, before one can expect the production of a jar. All this, however, will not prevent us from saying that the effect exists prior to its origination in its cause.

Therefore, even with reference to a jar which existed in the past, or which would exist in the future, we can say that, like a jar which now exists, it existed or would have an existence which can never be doubted. For, apart from our belief that the great sages possess like the Almighty the infallible knowledge of the past, the present and the future, one who wishes to produce a jar in

the future, a potter for instance, will be active in collecting earth and the means to mould it into a jar. If he were to believe that a jar would never come into existence, he would never waste his time in bringing together the material required for the production of the jar. His belief in the existence of a future jar or in that of a jar of yesterday, is as certain as his belief in the existence of a jar which is actually present before him. To his mind, a jar exists because the causes responsible for producing it exist. To say that a jar of the future time will not exist would therefore be as contradictory and absurd to him as to say that a jar which is actually seen is non-existent.

8. *Four varieties of non-existence*

And what does the concept of non-existence mean, and what are its implications? There are four varieties of it. The non-existence or the negation of a thing prior to its being originated is known as Prāgabhāva (Prāk -- before, and 'abhāva' -- negation). The non-existence after the thing is destroyed is known as Pradhvaṁsābhāva (Pradhvaṁsa meaning destruction). The Anyonya (separate from each other) abhāva occurs between two things such as a jar and a pot, and indicates that the existence of one of them implies the non-existence of the other and vice versa. While, what is known as Atyanta (absolute) abhāva takes place when one talks about the horn of a hare. It is a negation which is valid for all times. Of these four negations, the Anyonyābhāva or the reciprocal negation is not only typical but represents the general nature of the other three negations also. The negation of the jar does not necessarily exclude the existence of a piece of cloth or of other things, nor does it tell us anything regarding the nature of the jar. It exists independently apart from both the jar and the other things, though it necessarily refers to the jar. Even so, all the three other forms of negation have got a sort of existence, in that they also refer to the jar.

But even the expression 'non-existence prior to the origination of the jar' does not mean that it is the exact transcript of the description of the jar. The relation indicated by the genitive case involved in the expression itself means that the prior non-existence, instead of being identical with the jar, is different from it. One might adduce that in the expression 'the body of a statue

made of stone', the statue and the body are one and the same thing, and that therefore the use of the genitive does not necessarily imply that it brings about the relation between two different things. It should, however, be noted that the meaning of the terms 'statue' and of 'body' is absolute and not relative, and that therefore one can think of them as being identical. But where the meaning of a term has to be determined by reference to its correlative, there cannot be any identity between the meanings of the two terms. Prāgabhāva of the jar will have no meaning or existence unless it is first brought into relation with its correlative, namely, the jar. On the other hand, the jar will have its existence and meaning independent of the existence and meaning of the Prāgabhāva, as also of the existence of the other three varieties of abhāva (negation) as already noted. No kind of negation then will be able to prove that the jar has no existence prior to its being produced. Therefore it is that we hold that the effect has its existence in the form of its cause, and that the cause also exists prior to the manifestation of the effect out of it. There can be separable or inseparable connection between two things which have got existence, and not between two things one or both of which are non-existing. The rope and the jar are things which exist, and they can be thought of separately from each other; but cause and effect are things which must be considered as having existence, because neither of them can be understood in isolation without understanding the meaning of the other. Cause means that which produces the effect, and the effect means that which is produced by the cause. If they exist they must exist together, and their meanings understood with reference to each other. The effect exists as certainly as the cause. Thus considered the so-called non-existence of the effect (jar) is but another way of saying that it existed in the form of its cause (the earth).

9. *Death, the progenitor, and the all-devouring Prajāpati*

So, in the Śruti passage we are told that (all this) was covered by Death who is no other than the 'desire to eat the food'. As the desires are conceived by the intellect, the Primeval Being, known as Hiranyagarbha who resides in the intellect is then called as the Death. He then created the mind with the view to

creating the world. And when he became endowed with mind and began to worship, there arose out of his body 'Ka' which means either water or happiness. It is on this account that 'Ka' became known as the essence (arka) of water or happiness, namely, fire which is so useful for the Aśvamedha sacrifice. What that Arka is, Śruti tells us:

Water itself is the Arka. The solid part of that water accumulated and became known as the earth; whereupon Prajāpati became tired, but he practised penance; then there came forth fire as the essence of his body. 2

Prajāpati divided himself in three equally powerful portions, namely, fire, wind, and Sun. It is this first-born fire, which, though useful for the purpose of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, should be viewed as a horse in the form of the Virāt, that is the consciousness itself.

After this the Death thought to himself: 'let me be endowed with a body'; and with the help of the Mind which he had already created, he thought about speech in the form of the three Vedas which would be useful to him in creating the universe. Speech itself was the principle of duality (the couple as if of man and woman). The seed (semen) which came out of this couple was nothing but the consciousness of Prajāpati of what he had possessed in his previous birth, namely the consciousness of knowledge and works which he had acquired on account of his knowledge of the three Vedas. With that seed, he entered into the water and remained there for one Saṁvatsara (year) in the embryonic condition inside an egg. Naturally, as there was no record of time before, the creator of the Saṁvatsara became known as the Saṁvatsara Prajāpati, whom the Death had preserved for one year in his womb. Death then broke the egg; but as he was very hungry he opened his mouth to devour the first-born child out of the egg, namely, the Fire. Out of fear due to avidyā (ignorance), the child cried out the sound 'Bhān', which then became known as speech or Word. 3

One who knows and worships this all-devouring Prajāpati, or the Death, becomes himself the soul of all, and the eater of everything as food. 4

10. *Prajāpati becomes the sacrificial horse*

Remembering that in his previous birth he had performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice and that as a fruit of that he had become the Prajāpati, he thought of performing that great sacrifice again. He then practised a great penance, but like all other people became tired. On account of his penance, however, he got success and strength, by being endowed with prāṇa in the form of the senses such as eyes and others. But no sooner the prāṇas departed from his body, than the body became swollen and impure. Prajāpati, however, had loved his body so much that his mind became greatly attached to it. 5

Thereupon he thought to himself. 'Let this my body be fit for the purpose of sacrifice.' Thinking so, he entered into the body again. As soon as this was done, his body which had become impure for sacrifice on account of its being swollen (aśvat), was turned into a horse (aśva), who was none else but the Prajāpati himself. Thus it was that the body of Prajāpati became once again pure for being sacrificed in the form of a horse; and thus it is that both the horse and the Aśvamedha sacrifice in which he is sacrificed are being praised highly. What all this means is that Prajāpati thought that his own body was no better than a sacrificial horse, and that therefore he left it for one year to wander wherever it liked, that is, without being tied, or without its movement controlled in any way. Then, after the completion of one year, he sacrificed the horse for the sake of his own good, that is for the purpose of propitiating the great deity of Prajāpati. In other words, what he did was that he thought of his body as different from his real Being, and then sacrificed it for the pleasure of the latter. He then sacrificed other beasts for pleasing other deities also.

Following the example of Prajāpati, other performers of the sacrifice also suppose themselves to be the sacrificial horse, and then being sanctified by Vedic hymns, the chief priest (Hotā) sacrifices many beasts for various deities. And since the Prajāpati waited for one year (Samvatsara), and since the Samvatsara is, as if, the body of the Sun, considered in respect of Time, the fruit of the Aśvamedha sacrifice is none else but this shining Sun. And then the fire on this earth, known as Arka with which the sacrifice is performed becomes the means of obtaining that

fruit, and is therefore identified with the Sun and the Aśvamedha sacrifice. Naturally, the fire and the Sun together go to form one deity, which has been mentioned above as Death, and which, as has been also seen above (1,2,3), mentioned as dividing himself in three portions. Therefore, even after the sacrifice is over, the fire and the Sun, that is, the means and the end to be achieved, become once again unified into one Deity, namely the Death.

Therefore, one who considers the Aśvamedha sacrifice as Death only, that is one who considers himself as non-different from the sacrifice or Death, gets victory over Death. He dies only once, and not again and over again. Death cannot overtake him, since Death becomes the Ātman of that person. This is the fruit of the Upāsānā of the Aśvamedha sacrifice. 6

(Here ends Brāhmaṇa second of Adhyāya First of the
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIRST: BRĀHMAṆA THIRD

11. *The divine versus the demoniac heritage*

In narrating so far that Death is the end which one can attain by performing the Aśvamedha sacrifice, we have narrated, so to say, the ultimate end of works combined with knowledge. Now, begins the Udgitha Brāhmaṇa which will explain how the works and knowledge which act as means for achieving Death, come into being. What the Brāhmaṇa will tell us is that the knowledge of the Udgitha along with the activity attached to it will be able to carry one beyond Death, that is, as was already told in the ending portion of the second Brāhmaṇa, it will enable him to become either Fire or the Sun. As we shall see, this transcendence over Death means transcendence over sin. What that sin means, whence does it arise, and how it is to be overcome is explained presently by means of a parable.

Prajāpati had two kinds of sons. They were none else but his prāṇas, meaning thereby speech and other senses. Those of them who shone by the lustre of knowledge and works as instructed by the scriptures were known as gods (Devas): while those who were concerned with the directly but sensuously perceived, or indirectly and inferred knowledge and works, were known as

demons (Asuras). They were so known either because they indulged in the pleasures of the prāṇas or the senses (Asu=Prāṇa) or because they were opposed in nature to gods (a = not, sura = god). Being motivated by the directly perceivable and sensuous pleasures and by such works and knowledge which make their acquisition easy, the asuras were far greater in number than the gods who were motivated only by the desire to know the scriptures and their instructions regarding the works they should do. Naturally, there arose a conflict between the gods and the demons; and, as a result of this, as if there has been a perpetual conflict among the people of the world, and this has divided them into two camps. Those belonging to the one possess the divine heritage. While those belonging to the other possess the demoniac heritage. Sometimes the conflict ends in favour of the gods, and the demons are defeated; or sometimes it ends in favour of the demons, and the gods are defeated. With the success of the gods, righteousness becomes ascendent, and the gods get the opportunity of rising gradually to the status of Prajāpati; while with the success of the demons, unrighteousness becomes ascendent and the demons become gradually so degraded in nature that they get the birth of even plants or stones. And when the two forces are balanced equally, they are born as human beings.

12. *The power of the Upāsanā on the Chief Prāṇa*

So, when the gods were once defeated by the demons, they thought among themselves that they should resort to Prāṇa who can sing the Udgītha as a part of the activity involved in the sacrifice, known as Jyotiṣṭoma, and thus overcome the demons. They knew that they could do so by means of karma (works), namely, the meditation on the Mantra which will be described later on (Br. 1, 3, 28) as drawn from the Yajurveda (lead me from untruth to Truth and so on), and by the knowledge of the Prāṇa itself. Now, it should not be construed that what will presently be said about Prāṇa is just a sort of Arthavāda, that is a sort of praise subservient to the activity of meditation on the Mantra which causes the manifestation of a particular deity, and which therefore is known as the 'Abhyāroha' Mantra (abhi=towards, āroha=manifestation). For, in the first place, the context

refers not to the Udgitha as a part of Karma-kāṇḍa, but to the knowledge of the Upāsana of Prāṇa, which is very necessary for the carrying on of the activity of the meditation itself. Secondly, the Chief Prāṇa will be described as pure, while the other prāṇas, that is, speech and other senses, will be described as impure. And, thirdly, the fruit of this knowledge of the Chief Prāṇa will be described as the power to overcome death and to shine with lustre. Besides, if the interpretation of the Śruti is not to be done exactly in accordance with the meaning of the words in a particular context, then the knowledge of the various deities, God and the Ātman, will be as erroneous and dangerous as the knowledge of a pillar where there is actually a man, or that of a friend where there is an enemy. There will be no ultimate Good for man, if Śruti were not to be considered as infallible.

13. *The utility of a symbol*

Perhaps, this may be doubted, and it might be contended that just as erroneous knowledge about a pillar would arise on account of the viewing of it as a man, even so viewing the 'Nāma' and others as Brahman, we shall be having not only an erroneous knowledge about Brahman, but also about the Nāma and others which are not Brahman. But the argument is wrong. For, it should be remembered that knowledge about the Brahman by viewing it on the symbols of Nāma, etc., is like the knowledge of the Lord Viṣṇu, which can be had by worshipping him on the symbols of certain images. Just as the symbol or the image is not Viṣṇu, even so the Name, etc., are not the Brahman. They are different from each other. But this is exactly the reason why the Name, etc., are used as simply representative symbols for Brahman. As such, neither the Lord Viṣṇu nor the Brahman becomes unreal. Hence it is that while the sight of a pillar may be an occasion for producing the false knowledge of a man, the use of Name, etc., does not produce a false knowledge of Brahman.

Much less can one conclude that Brahman may not at all exist, even though the Name, etc., may be conceived as Brahman. For, just as R̥k. etc. can be conceived as Earth etc. though the latter actually exist, even so the Brahman can actually exist and yet be conceived to be the Name and others. Or it is equally

possible to argue from the reality of things which actually exist to the reality of those which are to be viewed as existing in them. The images and the Brāhmins actually exist; but as gods like Viṣṇu and the Fathers are to be supposed as existing in them respectively, they too are to be presumed to exist actually. It does not matter much from the viewpoint of arguing for the existence of a thing, if that very thing which is of greater value is supposed to be of lesser value by making it superimposed on things which actually possess less value. There the subordination of a thing of higher value is only apparent, but it serves the purpose of establishing the existence of that thing. For example, the existence of Fire in the so-called five fires which are not really fires, is only metaphorical; but that helps to prove the existence of an actual, independent element known as Fire. Even so, the supposed existence of Brahman in the Name etc., and the consequent belittling of it, is of utmost importance to prove the existence of Brahman.

14. *Comparison of Karma-kāṇḍa with Jñāna-kāṇḍa*

Besides, there is no fundamental difference between the nature of passages which inform us about the works to be done, the manner in which they ought to be done, the means and the fruits attending upon them, and the nature of the passages which inform us about equally extra-ordinary, non-sensuous, and non-inferential matters, such as gods, the deities and the highest Ātman, which possess or do not possess qualities and limitations. The only common source of these two kinds of passages, and the only criterion of the reality they possess are the Vedas. Whether one kind of passage tells us further to get ourselves engaged in actions, or whether another kind does not tell us to do so, it has nothing to do with the problem of the reality of both of them. That difference takes its rise from the totally different fact, namely, whether man has certain desires or not, and whether he wants or not to fulfil them. That is why, unlike in the Jñāna-kāṇḍa, we get in the Karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas such forms of verbs as indicate that some kind of action 'is to be done', 'ought to be done', etc. This, however, creates the false belief that it is only in the Karma-kāṇḍa that words go to form a complete sentence, and that the function of a sentence

is either to enjoin some action or to prohibit one from doing some other action. This would, however, amount either to cutting down the whole of the Jñāna-kāṇḍa as absolutely useless, or to allow it to be there as a subservient adjunct to the Karma-kāṇḍa, and as being only useful for praising or censuring a good or a bad action, as an Arthavāda sentence is supposed to do. But this is easier said than believed. For, how can one shut his eyes to what is stated in favour of Jñāna? The knower of Brahman attains the highest status (Tai. 2,1,1); 'the knots of doubts in his heart are broken' (Mun. 2,2,8); 'Avidyā as the seed of Saṃsāra is destroyed', etc. This shows that Jñāna is not subservient to any action; and as such, it cannot be an arthavāda. Sentences therefore which posit the reality of Brahman or the highest Ātman by the implicit or explicit use of the verb 'is', point to the independent existence of them.

15. *Knowledge is the import of the prohibitory actions also*

On the contrary, we can say that so far as the import of the prohibitory actions contained in the Vedas is concerned, it is not activity but knowledge. Obviously, the actions which are prohibited are not to be done at all. Nor are the prohibitions intended to advise us even implicitly as to what we should do. Their whole import consists in making us know what we are not to do. In other words, it is the knowledge of the prohibitory actions which saves us from the sin of doing them. It is the knowledge of what we should not eat, for instance, flesh or food offered by a person who is guilty of murdering a Brāhmin. It is this knowledge which prevents us from eating it as a wholesome or pure food, just as the knowledge that there is only a mirage and not water prevents us from running after the illusion. Thus, the importance of the Vedic prohibitions consists in giving us the exact knowledge of the nature of things or situations, though that knowledge might lead us further to desist from doing certain actions. Hence, we can say that activity is dependent on knowledge and not vice versa.

Even so, statements concerning the exact knowledge of the highest Ātman have all their import in this only. Naturally, one who has got the experience of the Ātman will not be deluded into believing what is contrary to the nature of the Ātman or in doing

such actions which would carry him away from the knowledge of the Ātman.

Extending the argument, we can say the same about actions, which are enjoined by the Vedas, including actions of daily routine which are supposed to be obligatory. These too have their origin in the false kind of knowledge and drive us away from the realization of the Ātman, inasmuch as they refer ultimately to the likes and dislikes of man, and are motivated either by the desire to obtain something or to avoid some evil result. Actions which pertain to the keeping of the sacrificial fire, and to the performance of sacrifices known as Darśa and Pūrṇamāsa, etc., have nothing to say about themselves, except telling us about the desires of man for heavenly or mundane pleasures and prosperity. Nothing else is required for the knowledge of the Ātman except the calmness of the mind; for, the Ātman cannot be determined or limited by anything that is temporal, spatial, or environmental in nature. There can be no room for any kind of action within the experience of Brahman. Hunger and thirst which arise on account of the bodily needs even in the case of the realizer of the Brahman, cannot be said to be on a par with actions which are obligatory or motivated by desires, because the latter are to be done at a particular time and with reference to a particular deity. In short, like the knowledge of the prohibitory actions, knowledge of sentences like 'Thou art that' (Tat tvamaṣi) also has the power to exclude all kinds of actions. 1

16. *The demons pierced the gods with evil*

To return to the parable, the gods thereupon approached the goddess of speech and requested her to sing the Udgītha for doing good unto them. She sang that portion of Sāmaveda consisting of three hymns and conferred upon the gods all the good fruits that could be achieved by other senses on account of the effect of speech upon them. She then sang nine hymns and said that all the good that might result from her good speech should go to herself. The demons, on the other hand, fearing that the singing the Udgītha might bring ruin on them, approached the goddess, and finding that she had the defect of being selfish, pierced into her their own sin. This sin was nothing but the hereditary one which existed in the speech of Prajāpati in his

former birth. That amounted to all that was contrary to the scriptures, including indecent, unwholesome and untrue speech. 2

The gods then approached one after another the divinities of Smell, Sight, Hearing, and Mind and requested them to sing the Udgītha for them. Every one did so, but retained for its own self whatever was the auspicious portion of the fruit. On all these occasions, the demons also, fearing that they might be destroyed, approached the deities and pierced into them the sins which they had inherited from the Prajāpati. The senses therefore began to smell, see, hear, or think what ought not to be smelt, seen, heard or thought (3-6). All this shows that though deities ruling over the various senses can become fit objects of upāsānā or worship so that they can lead a man from 'falsehood to truth', etc., as will be told later in 1.3.28, yet being selfish enough to appropriate all the beneficial portion of the fruit of singing of the Udgītha for themselves, they become unfit for being the objects of worship, and so for conferring good upon others or for saving themselves from Death.

17. But the Chief Prāṇa could not be pierced with evil

Being disappointed again and again by the experience that the worship of the deities of speech and other sense-organs could not save them from death, the gods requested the chief Prāṇa who resides in the mouth to sing the Udgītha for them. Prāṇa accepted the request and sang accordingly. As before, the demons thought of making the Prāṇa also as sinful as they had done the sense-organs, and so they fell upon him with force. But like a clod of earth dashing against a rock, they were defeated and destroyed in various ways, since the Chief Prāṇa is incapable of being contaminated by sin. Naturally with the defeat and the destruction of their enemies, as well as on account of their having resorted to the Chief Prāṇa, the deities in charge of the various sense-organs became free from the sins of having abused the senses, and were once again endowed with their original status of being of the nature of Fire, Earth, etc. In other words, they left off their false notion of being identified with the physical nature of being the essences of the five elements of Fire, etc.

As a result of this, one who performs the sacrifice (the Yaja-

māna) and looks upon the sinless Prāṇa and not the senses as his Ātman would attain to the divine nature of Prajāpati; but whosoever, notwithstanding his descent from the Prajāpati, hates the Yajamāna, becomes defeated and destroyed. Therefore instead of taking resort to the senses which are capable of being contaminated by selfishness and sin, one should resort to the chief Prāṇa who always remains uncontaminated by any blemish, and who therefore is capable of leading one through the purity of the senses to the attainment of the highest Ātman known as the Vairāja. 7

18. *Worship of the Chief Prāṇa results in the attainment of Divinity*

Being filled with the sense of gratitude, the other lesser prāṇas, that is the senses of speech, etc., wondered as to where that chief Prāṇa, who had enabled them to attain the divinity of the Ātman, might be residing. And as they began the search, they found out that being the common cause of both the bodies and senses, he lived in the body itself, and yet pervaded both of them. Unlike the commonly known impure condition of themselves, they found out that he is not only pure, but also independent, and that he lives in the ākāśa within the mouth without any support. A third characteristic which they discovered of that chief Prāṇa is that he is the essence of the entire body-complex, that is of the body and all its members. This is proved by the fact that when there is some damage to the Prāṇa, all the senses become dried up. Hence it is that this Prāṇa should be known and worshipped as the Ātman, after leaving away the contact of the senses, though he resides amidst the various effects, such as the body and the senses. 8

This deity of Prāṇa is known as 'Dūh', that is, as being 'far away', because it is able to keep the Death away from itself. Just as the senses of Speech, etc., can be useful in enabling a man to go beyond them, even so the deity of Prāṇa, if properly worshipped will lead a man to the reality beyond it, namely, the Ātman. Therefore one who worships the Prāṇa obtains the twofold fruit of freedom from sin and the attainment to Divinity. It need not be supposed that because the Prāṇa is said to be the essence (Aṅgīrasa) of the body and the senses, it too

would, like the touch of a corpse, be sinful to the extent to which the senses would be. For, it has already been shown that the Prāṇa is pure, though it resides in the body and in the senses. This is why even death which might be imminent is said to be far away from it. It should be clear, in other words, that the Prāṇa is deathless. Hence it is that one who worships the Prāṇa becomes himself free from death. It must, however, be remembered that the worship or the Upāsana of Prāṇa consists in mentally contemplating for a very long period that one is none else but this deathless Prāṇa. In doing so, he must not allow himself to be distracted by any obstacle in his daily, practical life; he has to achieve this within his lifetime, so that he would continue to live the life Divine even after his death. Then alone can it be said about him that having attained to Divinity, he has become one with it. 9

One might say that Upāsana of Prāṇa is neither obligatory as a daily routine nor meant for a specific purpose (neither nitya nor naimittika) whereby it could have kept away the death in the form of sins. On the contrary, it is Kāmya, that is. motivated by the desire for some fruit. How then can sin be wiped away or be unable to contaminate a person who resorts to the Prāṇopāsana? The reply is that it is because one who has the consciousness that he is the Prāṇātman is in direct opposition to one who is contaminated by the contact with the sensuous objects of desire. The unlimited, divine consciousness of oneself being the Prāṇātman would certainly overpower the limited, egotistic, and the natural consciousness of one who is immersed in sensuous pleasures, just as the knowledge that there is a rope would cancel the illusion of a serpent on it. This means that even though the divinity of Prāṇa is capable of destroying the sins, it does not do so unless one becomes endowed with the consciousness that he has the divinity of Prāṇa in him on account of his Upāsana.

When once the sinful persons and their sins are thus driven away to the ends of the quarters, one who has developed within him the consciousness that he is the Prāṇātman should never again visit those sinful places and the sinful persons living there. Being always dreadful of the possibility that he might himself be sinful on account of contact with them, he should avoid them forever. 10

The worship of the Prāṇa as the Ātman thus enables a man to go beyond the death and sins. But lo, the greatness of the Prāṇa! Not only does it bring sinlessness to the organs of senses, but it enables them to be endowed with their original glory of being the divinities of Fire, etc. As Speech was the first to sing the Udgitha, Prāṇa too, first of all, carried it beyond death. Forthwith Speech began to shine with her original lustre of Fire. Then, one after another were relieved of their sins, the senses of Smell, Sight, Hearing, and the Mind. They too were transformed immediately into the original divinities of the Wind, the Sun, the Quarters, and the Moon, respectively; and forthwith they began to shine very brilliantly beyond the province of death. All this happens in the case of a man who worships the Prāṇa as his own Ātman. 11-16

19. *Prāṇa as the essence and support of the body*

Another characteristic of Prāṇa is that he is the support of the body and of all the senses. This seems unbelievable since Prāṇa too like the senses of Speech, etc., sang the first three hymns of Pavamāna for the general well-being known as Prājāpatya, but sang the remaining nine hymns for his own good, namely, for the obtainment of food. And yet, he ate the food not for the sake of his own nourishment but for the sake of maintaining the strength and the well-being of the body and the senses. Hence, he does not incur any sin like the Speech, etc., who sang for their own selfish ends. 17

The sense-deities also who demanded a share in the food eaten by the Prāṇa and who were readily allowed by the Prāṇa to enter into him for that purpose, were fully satisfied, though in an indirect way by the nourishment which the food gave unto them. Therefore, one who knows that Prāṇa is the support of the senses, and also knows that he himself is of the nature of the Prāṇātman becomes able to support the men of his kind; he becomes the leader and the Chief amongst them. And as the word 'Annāda' also means 'freedom from disease', he becomes so, on account of his being endowed with good appetite. Those, however, who hate such a person perish like the demons who hated the Prāṇa. 18

It has been mentioned in Kaṇḍikā 8 above that Prāṇa is the

essence of the whole of the body including all its members; but the reason for this is stated here, namely, that the body and the senses are dependent on the Prāṇa for their very existence. This is proved by the fact that when the Prāṇa departs from a particular limb, forthwith that limb becomes dried up and loses all its strength. Hence it is not the senses, but the Prāṇa which is the proper object of worship. 19

It must be remembered in this connection that Prāṇa being disembodied and all-pervading cannot be said to assume different dimensions of physical bodies corresponding to different beings. Prāṇa cannot be compared to a lamp which has the capacity to spread its light according to the room in which it is placed. One may say that the lamp possesses the capacity to contract or expand according to the space it illumines. But this will not apply to Prāṇa; because on account of its equal pervasion in all, in spite of the differences in dimensions, all the beings namely, the bee, etc., are equal to each other and are infinite in nature. Knowing this all, one who worships the Prāṇa as his own Ātman becomes one with it (Sāyujyatā) or at least resides in the neighbourhood of it (Salokatā). 22

20. *Prāṇa, the same as Udgitha*

Prāṇa therefore is Udgitha also. It was on account of the singing of the Udgitha that the demons were afraid that they would be defeated. But Udgitha does not mean the act of singing; it is a part of Sāma, though it is used for the purpose of singing. It does not matter if the word 'Udgitha' does not mean prāṇa etymologically, nor is used by way of convention in that sense. But the prefix 'Ut' in 'Udgitha' suggests the quality of Prāṇa, namely that it upholds the whole world by its power, and thereby is sufficient to denote the Prāṇa, while 'Githa' means the 'Vāk'. The root 'Gai' in 'Githa' which means 'to utter', also suggests that Udgitha is a kind of devotion and consists of speech. In short, that speech which is governed and guided by Prāṇa is the Udgitha. 23

That the divinity of Udgitha is Prāṇa is strengthened by an anecdote. One Caikitanaya Brahmadatta said while he was drinking the Soma juice, 'If this Chief Prāṇa in the mouth, the essence of body has been able to sing by any other power except that of

the Vāk-Prāṇa (Udgītha), then let this very juice cut off my head'. This only shows that one should firmly believe that Prāṇa alone is the divinity of Udgītha. 24

That this divinity of Sāma or the Udgītha has the additional qualities of the melody of voice, clarity of expression and power is further described in three kaṇḍikās. The 'Svara', that is the melody of the voice which comes out of the throat is really the 'Sva' or the riches or the ornament of that speech or sāma. For this a mere wish is not sufficient. One has to adopt other means such as the quality of Su-varṇa, the knowledge of the clear-cut pronunciation of different sounds of alphabet, according as they are palatal, dental etc. (26). The third quality of sāma is the knowledge of the support on which it depends, namely, of the speech or the Prāṇa, though according to some, it has its support in anna or food. Whatever may be one's belief, it is certain that the Sāma takes its residence in the body of a man; and so, one is free to worship with the faith that either prāṇa or the food is the support of sāma. 27

Hereafter comes the description of the process of ascending meditation known as the 'Abhyāroha' of the Pavamāna hymns. So, while the Prastotā is singing the Sāma, the Yajamāna should also meditate on the three mantras of the Yajurveda which are (1) Lead me from non-existence (asat) to existence (sat); (2) lead me from darkness to light; and (3) lead me from death to immortality. The first mantra means that death itself is non-existence, that is, what goes by the name of ordinary mundane activity and the knowledge about it; but it alone might lead a man to the lowest kind of existence, which is as good as non-existence or death. As opposed to this, scriptural activity and scientific knowledge would lead him to higher and higher planes of existence up to immortality (amṛta). The second mantra therefore tells us something more than what the first mantra tells. Here, the darkness (tama) means the ignorance of the Reality, and the light (jyoti), the knowledge about it. While the third mantra repeats what has been told by the two mantras taken together, we might say that the first mantra tells us that instead of doing nothing one should wish to resort to the practice of some sādhanā. The second tells us that instead of going by the wrong path, one should wish to go by the right one, so that he may reach the destination. And the third is nothing but the restate-

ment of the first two.

And when the Prastotā, after having finished his singing of the sāma for the benefit of the Yajamāna, begins to sing the remaining nine hymns for his own well-being, the Yajamāna also should pray at the same time to obtain a boon which will yield him his desired object.

Thus it has been told so far that the combination of activity and of knowledge regarding it enables one to attain the divinity of Prāṇa. One who knows that the speech and other four senses, are dependent upon Prāṇa, and are of the nature of Fire, etc.; that he is free from the demon of natural sin which sticks to a man on account of his being contaminated by the pleasures of the senses; that what he eats as food is the cause of the existence and nourishment of the body and the senses; that in being the essence of the body (Angirasa) he is the Ātman of all beings; that he is the originator and pervader of the Vāk and of all its manifestations in the forms of Ṛk, Yajus, Sāma, and Udgītha; that he is both the melody and the explicit and clear expression of the alphabet and words of the Sāma, and that he is the support of the Udgītha will alone get the fruit of the divinity of Prāṇa. One is therefore recommended to practise this Upāsana till he himself comes to know that he has realized the divinity. 28

(Here ends the third Brāhmaṇa of the First Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIRST: FOURTH BRĀHMAṆA

So far has been described the way of combining action and its knowledge as well as the Prāṇopāsana as the means of attaining the status of Prajāpati. Now begins this fourth Brāhmaṇa with the view to describing the power and the freedom of Prajāpati in his activities of creating, protecting, and dissolving the universe, as also the description of the great prosperity which would be available by following the praiseworthy Vedic way of Karma and Jñāna. With all this the Karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Veda deals with saṁsāra only; for it is not free from fear, hatred, etc. It deals with physical bodies and senses, and with objects which are sensuous, gross, and perishable.

The knowledge of this will, however, be useful in view of what is going to be told hereafter (in the 7th and 8th Kaṇḍikās of this Brāhmaṇa); namely, the Brahma-vidyā which alone will result in the liberation from bondage. It might create in man disgust for saṁsāra and even for the glory of Prajāpati and make him fit for obtaining the Brahma-vidyā. For, unless a man becomes really disgusted with Samsāra he will not be fit for realizing the Brahma-vidyā, just as for a man who has no thirst, water has no purpose to serve.

21. *Prajāpati creates by dividing himself into two halves*

Now what was in the very beginning before any other embodied being was born was the Prajāpati, the first-born Puruṣa out of a great egg, known also as Virāt and endowed with body and limbs, such as head, hands, feet etc. He saw himself and nothing else besides him. Naturally, the very first word he uttered on account of his being endowed with the Vedic karma and jñāna of his prior existence were, 'I am the Prajāpati'. This consciousness of the 'I' or the ego was responsible for his being known by the mysterious name, 'Ahaṁ'. This must be the reason why, when the causal body of Prajāpati gave him the name 'ahaṁ'; the bodies that were born as effects out of that causal body gave the same name to the innumerable beings also. That is why when a person is asked, 'Who are you,' he first replies 'It is I', and then explains that he is Devadatta or Yajñadatta, as he might be named by his parents. Therefore it is this very name 'Ahaṁ' which is recommended for the Upāsana of Prajāpati.

His other name is Puruṣa. For, it was he who in his previous birth proved himself to be the most excellent sādḥaka on account of his having burnt all the sins which could have prevented him from becoming Prajāpati, and by the fire of his penance in the form of Vedic karma and knowledge about it. Therefore, whosoever does the Upāsana in this excellent manner will not only be able to burn the sins, but also be able to defeat all other aspirants who might not come to his standard, just as in a race whosoever runs fast and reaches the destination first defeats all others. 1

The Upaniṣad, however, tells us further that like ordinary

people even this great Prajāpati feared when he found out that he was alone. But as he thought, so his fear vanished no sooner than he realized the Ātman. But why did he fear at all when there was nothing else except him which could have made him afraid? He had a body with hands and feet and senses, though infinite in extent; and it was with this body that he identified himself before the knowledge of the Ātman dawned upon him. The fear was due to avidyā, that is, due to the ignorance of the Ātman. Though in his previous birth, he might have had the knowledge of the unity of the Ātman, in his new birth it was mixed up with at least a sprinkling of avidyā due to which he could not have a full gaze at the Ātman.

A question arises as to what had made him then to acquire the knowledge of the Ātman in the new birth? Was there any spiritual teacher who imparted him that knowledge? Did he undergo any moral and spiritual discipline like śravaṇa, manana, etc.? If not, neither faith, nor service to the Guru, surrender, bowing down, etc., will have any purpose to serve. The reply is that an unimpeded knowledge, dispassion (Vairāgya) glory, and piety, which had burnt down all his sins in his previous birth, were all unimpaired even at the time of his new birth. So, without any kind of śravaṇa, manana, etc., it was quite possible for him to recall by memory the Ātmajñāna, which he had obtained in his previous birth. And there is no hard and fast rule that there should be only one kind of means for the emergence of the knowledge of the unity of the Ātman. Vāmadeva, who was equally great like the Prajāpati, had also his excellent karma of his previous life as being responsible for the Ātmajñāna. As the Taittirīyopaniṣad tells us, it was penance (tapa) in the case of Bhṛgu. In the case of others like Śvetaketu, there might be a combination of several causes, such as faith in the Guru, surrender, śravaṇa, manana, etc. This can be illustrated by examples from other distinct fields of experience. To have the knowledge of the form (rūpa) of an object what is required in the case of a man is the contact of a particular sense with that object, as also the medium of light. For the animals there is no necessity of this medium; while in the case of a Yogin, neither the contact nor the medium is necessary. His mind alone has the power to visualize the form of the object. In short, though, in the case of man, faith in the Guru,

surrender, service, etc., are necessary as the external means for the emergence of Ātmajñāna over and above the internal one of understanding the meaning of the Mahāvākya such as 'Tat Tvam asi' in the case of great souls like Prajāpati, the recollection of the mere meaning of the statement is sufficient. 2

One reason why the life and eminence of even the Prajāpati comes under the domain of Samsāra, as has been noted above, is the fear of death which had overtaken him. Another reason is that his desire of meeting a woman remained unfulfilled, since he was all alone. He, therefore, divided himself into two parts, as if it was the splitting of a bamboo into two equal halves. One half was himself, while the other half became a woman. But as she was born of him, she was indeed his daughter only. And yet, that Prajāpati, known as Manu, had a union with her, who was known by the name, Śatarūpā. She then thought she should be invisible, and so she became a cow. Whereupon the Prajāpati became a bull and had intercourse with her, and produced cows and bulls. Then she became successively a mare, a she-ass, a she-goat, and so on, and he too became a horse, a he-ass, a goat, etc., and produced male and female beings in the world, down to the very ant. Therefore the Prajāpati thought that inasmuch as all this was produced by him, he was himself the whole universe. 3-5

22. *Various opinions about the nature of Prajāpati*

In this connection there is a great difference between the opinions of learned men. Some think that the Hiraṇyagarbha is none else but the Paramātman. Others think that he is a transmigratory soul. To begin with the first opinion, it is said that he is 'spoken of as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa and Agni'. Or, as the Aitareyopaniṣad says (5.3), 'He is the Brahmā, the Indra, the Prajāpati as also the whole assemblage of gods'. The Manusmṛti (12-123) says that 'this Paramātman is spoken of as Agni, Manu or Prajāpati'; and elsewhere again (Manu. 1,7) it says that 'he who is supra-sensuous, inscrutable, subtle, unmanifest, eternal, incomprehensible, Paramātman and immanent in all the beings, has manifested himself here in the form of Hiraṇyagarbha'.

As opposed to this, some consider him as being subject to birth and death, and cite in their favour passages from both the Śruti

and Smṛti. As has been already seen, this very Upaniṣad speaks about him (1.4.1), as one who had burnt all his sins, meaning thereby that one who has no eternal life can alone commit sins. It speaks about his fear and dissatisfaction (1.4.2 & 3). And, presently, it speaks about him as 'being himself mortal, he has produced the immortal gods'. The Śvetāśvatara (4.12) makes mention of him as one who saw the Hiraṇyagarbha as being born. And the Manusmṛti (12,50) speaks about him as the 'excellent spiritual condition, though unmanifest and great'.

Notwithstanding this apparent opposition, both the opinions are correct from different points of view. When the Kāthopaniṣad says about the realized soul (1,2,21) that 'though he is sitting steadily, he goes to a far-off place, and though he is lying down, he moves in all places', what it means is that the knower of Ātman appears to be saṁsāri on account of the Upādhis of body and mind, in spite of his not being so in reality. In like manner, the Hiraṇyagarbha is both one and many; he is all beings in the world inasmuch as 'every being is in reality the Tat (Brahman)', according to the Chāndogyopaniṣad (6.8.16). The only difference between the Hiraṇyagarbha and the ordinary jivas is that whereas the being who is totally unaffected by the upādhis is considered as the Paramātmā, all the jivas being more or less affected by the Upādhis are generally considered as bound by the saṁsāra. Śruti and Smṛti are, however, one in saying that who-soever remains uncontaminated by the upādhis is in reality none else but Paramātmā. But alas, the mere logicians, who infer in any way they like, have made the scriptural meaning difficult to understand.

To return to the topic of the creation by Prajāpati. All this existence consisting of names and forms was, however, originally without any name and form. It came into being on account of the Vedic means of karma and jñāna which obviously involved the presence of a doer, activity and the instruments of that activity, as also the result of it, namely, the attainment of the status of Prajāpati. But this can never become the means of attaining liberation which being dependent on the will of Brahman (Vastu) and not on the will of man, is, beyond the province of the perceptible world of names and forms. The seed of this tree of existence is karma, and avidyā (ignorance of Reality) is the soil in which it flourishes. That is why it must be rooted out. The

Purāṇas describe this tree as the 'eternal Brahma-vṛkṣa (tree)', with its root upwards, namely, the Brahman, and the branches such as Hiranyagarbha and others, downwards (Chā. 6,8,3). Therefore that which was unknown and unmanifest has become this manifested world which is known to man as consisting of names and forms.

23. *Brahman as immanent and transcendent*

That unmanifest, original state, namely the Brahman is itself the cause of this world of names and forms is further shown by the statement that He entered into all the bodies of the beings from the creator to the pillar. But if the Brahman alone is real, all the names and forms as also the entrance of Brahman in them are only superimpositions (āropa) on it on account of the Avidyā which is the only cause of this āropa, and which therefore should not be considered as merely non-existence prior to vidyā or right knowledge. The eternal Brahman or the Ātman which is the basic reality is said to be pure like water on which arise the impure foam and bubbles of names and forms. As there is no trace of avidyā in Him, he is said to be the eternal knowledge itself (Nitya-buddha). He is quite different from the creation, though the creation cannot remain apart from him.

But why should we suppose, one might ask, that Brahman created the world and himself entered into it afterwards, just as it is given in common experience that a carpenter prepares a house, before it is occupied. The statement regarding the 'entrance' should not be taken as a literal truth. It has the sense of 'reflection' in something which has the capacity to reflect. The Sun happens to be in contact with water, and so he is reflected in it. The Ātman cannot have any contact with anything else in the world; and so, it cannot be said that his entrance is just like the reflection of the Sun in water. Nor can it be said that the entrance can be in the manner in which the attributes can be thought of as belonging to or as having entered into the substance; for, the Brahman being absolutely self-dependent need not take its shelter into the effects. Nor again will it be proper to say that the Brahman enters into its creation just as a seed enters (becomes) into the tree or fruit; for, in that case Brahman shall have to be conceived as having parts within it, and subject to

growth, disease, decay, and death. Nor can it be argued that someone other than the Ātman must have entered into the created beings; for, as the Upaniṣads tell us (Chā. 6,3,2-3; Tai. 2,6,1), it is the divinity of Brahman who saw all that he had created and then entered into them; 'He broke open the mid-portion of the skull and entered into the body (Ait. 3, 12); 'He assumed various forms' (Ka. 2,2,9). 'Living in all the beings as the inner self of all he is the undivided, all-pervading one God only (Śve. 6,11). That is, he has not become many, though he appears to be so on account of the many forms he assumes. Pleasure and pain do not affect him in the least (Ka. 2,2, 11). Sensuous perception and other means of knowledge take cognizance of qualities like pleasure and pain which arise on account of the upādhis which are superimposed upon the Caitanya (Brahman); and so, the Upaniṣadic passages which tell us about the eternal Ātman cannot be construed as being contradictory to the perception and other means of knowledge which are available in the sensible world. 'Do not imagine that you can see the seer of that sight' (Bṛ. 3.4.2); 'How can one know the knower' (Bṛ. 4.5.19); 'Himself remaining unknown the Ātman knows everything' (Bṛ. 3.8.11); all these passages inform us that the knowledge of the perceptible world is not the knowledge of the Ātman. Besides, when a man says, 'it is I' or complains that he has a pain in his leg or head, or is happy on account of some one dear to him, what is meant is that the consciousness of that 'I' and of pleasure or pain, refers not to the Ātman, but to the body and its limbs with which the Ātman has erroneously identified itself owing to Avidyā.

24. *Wrong views of the logicians and others*

Even the argument of the logicians that the Ātman has the fourteen attributes, such as intellect, pleasure, pain, like, dislike, effort, dharma, adharma, etc., is of no avail in showing that the Ātman is of the nature of the transmigratory soul. For, what the logicians put forth is against what the Śruti tells us. The logicians might argue that just as the imperceivable ākāśa is believed to exist on account of its attribute, namely, the sound which is perceived directly, even so, one may grant the existence of the Ātman only on the strength of the existence of its attributes,

namely, pleasure, pain, etc. Experience of an object is possible when the substance and attributes of that object can be simultaneously perceived. For instance, a white piece of cloth is perceivable because the substance cloth and its attribute, whiteness, are directly perceivable at the same time. But such is not the case with the Ātman and the feeling of pain. What is felt is the pain only, because it belongs to the body which is equally perceived. Therefore, we are prevented from saying that the pain belongs to the Ātman. Even in the case of the ākāśa, it will not be correct to say that sound is an attribute of it; for, what is known as ākāśa is the 'Tan-mātrā' (essence) of sound. In short, pain and other attributes appear to belong to the Ātman on account of their being reflected in Buddhi and therefore being superimposed on the Ātman. In none of the other eight non-sentient substances of the logicians, such as earth and others, there is the possibility of pain, etc., being superimposed. It arises in the body only and so is not a quality of the Ātman.

In the same manner, the opinion of the Vaiśeṣikas that qualities like pain, etc., arise on account of the contact of the mind with the Ātman cannot be accepted, because the conception of contact will make the Ātman as consisting of parts, shortlived, and subject to change. To say that the eternal Ātman can be the shelter of the changing qualities, just as the eternal ākāśa is of the changing sound is not correct. For, this will contradict the Śruti statement that 'From the Ātman ākāśa is born' (Tai.2.1). Similarly, the so-called eternal entities of the logicians, namely, the quarters (dik), time (kāla) and mind and atom (aṇu) are all shortlived. The dik comes under ākāśa; kāla is produced; mind is an effect of food (anna); and paramāṇu is an assumed entity beyond tryaṇuka (a triad having the smallest dimensions). There can be no contact of the Ātman with anyone of these shortlived entities; and there will be no sense in persisting to say that a thing can be eternal in spite of constant change in it, though it may be convenient from the practical point of view to say so. Nor will it be correct to say as the Jainas hold that the Ātman can be considered as eternal in spite of its being the doer and a combination of parts; for, if it can be divided into parts, the parts may perish one by one.

Finally comes for consideration the inference known as Arthāpatti, that is an inference regarding the implication of the meaning from circumstances. If the Ātman can never be subject to

pain, then why should anyone try to become free from it by undergoing the study of the scriptures? The reply is that though according to the Advaita doctrine, the Ātman never suffers from pain, and that there is none else who can be said to suffer, the study of the scriptures will not be in vain, inasmuch as it is indispensable for removing the misery that arises on account of the superimposition of it on the Ātman, due to Avidyā.

25. *The entrance of the Ātman is metaphorical*

After having disposed of all the possible objections against the concept of the entrance of the Ātman into his own creation, the Upaniṣad now begins to explain the nature of that entrance on the analogy of the entrance of the Sun in water in the form of his reflected image. The Sun does not actually enter into the water; nor is the reflected image of the Sun a real object, and yet metaphorically the Sun can be said to have entered into water on account of the false image produced in it by the Sun. Even so, the Ātman has no contact with anything else; nothing else is real; the creation of the world of sensible objects appears there in space and time as an effect produced by the Ātman, but all the same, having no more reality than that of the reflected image of the Sun in water. And yet, one may continue to say metaphorically that the Ātman has entered into his own creation. The partless and the all-pervading Ātman cannot therefore be said to have come from some particular direction or is proceeding towards some other direction or place, in order to have its entrance into something else.

What then is the use of this unreal concept of the entrance of the Ātman? Why should it not be rejected altogether? The reply is that though unreal, it is useful for the purpose of Ātmajñāna, just as the belief that the world is produced, maintained and dissolved is useful for the same purpose. To know that a thing which bears no fruit is stated in close proximity to something which bears fruit; then the former should be considered as being only a subordinate part of the latter. Following this directive, we can say that the statements about the entrance of the Ātman and his creation, etc., are only to be taken as ancillary to the statement of the central topic, namely, that the Ātmajñāna is

the chief end of human life. This is borne by the various Śruti passages, such as, 'He realized the Ātman only'; 'He became all on account of his having known the Ātman' (Br. 1.4.10); 'One who knows the Brahman becomes the Brahman' (Tai. 2.1.1, Mu. 3.2.9); 'One who has a spiritual teacher will attain the Brahman' (Chā. 6.14.2). The Bhagavadgītā also says, 'Knowing Me by means of devotion, he then enters into Me' (18.55). In view of this, we have to bear in mind that the only function of statements concerning creation and of the entrance of the Ātman into it, is to divert the mind away from the various distinctions of the practical worldly life, and from all consequent fear including that of death, and to enable it to focus its attention on the achievement of the Ātmajñāna. To know and realize then that the Ātman is not only transcendent but also immanent in all is, in other words, the real meaning of the passages which tell us about the entrance of the Ātman in all the created things of the world.

To what extent this supposed entrance of the Ātman is extended in the body of a man, the Upaniṣad tells us that he is full up to the very tips of the nails, just as the razor fully occupies the razor-case, or just as fire is immanent in the wood, though hidden. This is analogous either to the specific and conscious hearing, seeing, etc., in the waking condition of men, or to the common but unconscious breathing which continues even during sleep. According to the specific activities of breathing, speaking, seeing, hearing, and thinking, the Ātman also becomes specifically known as prāṇa, vāk, eye, ear, and mind. There will thus be various names of the Ātman with reference to the various activities, but he will be, to that extent, restricted and imperfect. And, so, one who worships him as endowed with a particular quality or activity will never know the Brahman fully and truly. No doubt, he shall be able to discern the two powers of the Ātman, namely, that which is with reference to action and that which is with reference to knowledge of the names and forms of the external world. But it is these three, actions, names, and forms, that constitute the whole of the phenomenal existence (Saṁsāra). They do not and cannot define the Ātman as he is, that is, as enveloping all the specific aspects in which he appears on account of the various adjuncts or adjectives of karma, nāma and rūpa. The Ātman is beyond speech, mind and the law of causation; realizing this one should worship him.

26. *Realization of the Ātman arrests activity*

In this connection, there arises the question whether or not the Ātman becomes amenable to some kind of injunction. The reply of the Śruti is that it is not, 'Brahman is directly seen' (Bṛ. 3.4.1); 'the Ātman is knowledge itself' (Bṛ. 4.3.7). By knowing Him, the egoism due to attachment to things other than the Ātman, and the tendency to superimpose these on the Ātman are destroyed; and as a result of this, desires and other blemishes also are removed. There remains then only the love for the Ātman.

This is, however, challenged by a strong opposition. It is pointed out, in the first place, that there is no difference between jñāna and upāsana (knowledge and worship); and as the upāsana is a mental activity, there must be certain rules for its proper guidance. Otherwise there will not emerge the knowledge of the Ātman. Second, as it is well known, the senses get themselves interested in the knowledge and the activities of the external world, and so man does not become inclined to have the knowledge of the Ātman, unless he is persuaded to follow some rules of spiritual discipline. Third, there is a close affinity between the injunctions pertaining to a sacrificial activity and those pertaining to the upāsana of the Ātman. For instance, we get the passage, 'O Maitreyi, this Ātman should be seen, thought about and contemplated upon' (Bṛ. 2.4.5). Fourth, the knowledge regarding the purpose, the means and the manner in which a sacrifice is to be performed, as also the way in which the knowledge of the Ātman is to be secured, are equally important as aspects of both karma and jñāna.

But this is not correct. For, the description of the nature of the Ātman and the exclusion of all that is un-Ātman does not suggest any other activity which is to be carried on by the mind or the body. So, the recommendation that one should worship the Ātman does not carry any advice regarding the practice of some other action, physical or mental, beyond the bare mentioning of the nature of the Ātman. The 'Vidhi-vākya', that is, a sentence regarding some action to be done, implies in the very statement of it that a certain kind of activity other than the knowledge of that sentence must necessarily be done in order to achieve a desired fruit. For instance, one who wishes to

go to heaven should perform the Darśa and the Pūrṇamāsa sacrifices is a 'Vidhi-vākya'; for, it states explicitly that over and above the promise of a place in the heaven, some sort of activity, namely, the performance of sacrifices is to be done by some one who not only has the desire to go to heaven but who has also the sanction of the Śāstras (adhikāra) to do so. The Vidhi-vākya therefore contains in it both the knowledge of the vākya as also the mention of the activity to be done accordingly. The statements regarding the knowledge of the Ātman, on the contrary, do not lead us beyond that knowledge to some sort of activity, and so, there is no 'Vidhi' to be observed by this or that person. Here, there is an end to activity. Unconditional (nirupādhika) knowledge is the aim of Ātmajñāna; the Vidhi-vākya, on the other hand, aims at activity, and so its knowledge is 'Sopādhika'.

It is on account of this that knowledge which is 'sopādhika', that is, which is supported by conditions and circumstances, can never be able to counteract or cancel that which is created by make-believe or false knowledge, though this knowledge is capable of inducing a person to act. On the contrary, knowledge regarding the non-dual Brahman, implied in the statement 'that thou art', is capable of sublating all phenomenal, false, and illusory knowledge regarding objects other than the Ātman, and is therefore capable of arresting the activity of man. This shows that whenever there occurs the sublation of the un-Ātman, that is, whenever there occurs the knowledge of the Ātman, there occurs the cessation of human activity; and that whenever there occurs any human activity, there is no sublation of the knowledge of the un-Ātman. In short, there is the clear-cut opposition between Ātmajñāna and karma.

One might still contend that some kind of recommendation to do an action is necessary even to induce a person to listen to the descriptive statement about the Ātman and its knowledge. The Ātman might be described any number of times; but will this make a man desire to have that knowledge? Some one must point out why it is desirable and what should be done to achieve it. Before, however, coming to any conclusion on this point, we must first be definite as to what it is regarding which some injunction is necessary. Is it with reference to Ātmajñāna, or with reference to the hearing of the statements regarding the

nature and the characteristics of the Ātman, or with reference to the desire to keep constant the memory of what is heard, or with the control of the states of the mind? Supposing, in the first place, that it refers to Ātmajñāna, it must be remembered, as has been already stated, that the knowledge of the Ātman arises on account of the mere hearing about it. So, what will mere 'Vidhi' achieve in this respect? To say, in the second place, that none will be inclined to obtain Ātmajñāna unless he is told to do something which will be favourable for that purpose, will only involve *regress ad infinitum*. This will be equally true in the case of Vidhi-vākya also. For instance, the injunction 'one should perform agnihotra' would require a prior injunction such as, 'one should listen to the manner in which the agnihotra is to be performed', which again would require an injunction to support it, and so on *ad infinitum*. Besides, will it be too much to say that one will naturally be inclined to attend to the meaning of a passage which describes the nature of the Ātman, in exactly the same way as one would attend to the meaning of statements which are false and dangerous to believe? To say, in the third place, that some injunction is required to keep intact the memory of the meaning of the sentence conveying the Ātmajñāna, is also not correct. For, the memory of this kind is vouchsafed by the very fact that the meaning is understood by the intellect. The moment the meaning is grasped, it destroys automatically the false knowledge about the Ātman; and along with it is destroyed the memory about the false distinctions between things and things which are due to the ignorance of the Ātman. This means that the memory of the knowledge of the Ātman remains constantly alive, without the extraneous help of any injunction, though it is true that the sublation of grief, infatuation, fear, etc., on account of the Ātmajñāna helps to strengthen the memory of it to a great extent.

To come to the final and the fourth contention of the objector, namely, that the control of the states of the mind, being altogether different from the Ātmajñāna, can be construed as a vidhi-vākya for the purpose of attaining Ātmajñāna, is also not to the point. The Pātañjala Yoga mentions this as a means of liberation, inasmuch as it leads one to Samādhi and to the lodgement of one's self in its real nature (I. 2-3). In the Vedānta, however, this need not be recognized. Here, nothing

except the knowledge of the Brahman is regarded as the means of liberation. Even the stoppage of the Vṛttis (states) of the citta (mind) depends upon the constant flow of the consciousness that one is none else but the Brahman. And so, no sooner is this achieved than not only the Vṛttis but all sorts of desires cease to trouble the mind.

27. The validity of the Vedānta lives within itself

A peculiar feature of the Vedānta is that it cannot be used as a means of proving the validity (pramāṇa) of something else. The passages therein tell us about something which is already accomplished, and not about something which is to be accomplished by the adoption of some means. But this raises a doubt in the minds of some who are therefore tempted to say that the Vedānta passages, if they are not to be utterly useless, should at least be construed as being on a par with the Arthavāda sentences which are being used for conveying censure or praise, and are therefore subservient to some kind of action. For instance, the sentence 'the fire wept', which has apparently no meaning worth the name, is useful for conveying the meaning that silver should not be used as an oblation in fire. But the Vedānta needs no such mercy. For, unlike the arthavāda sentence, it has got its own independent meaning, inasmuch as it is attended upon by the definite result, namely, the total removal of all avidyā, grief, infatuation, fear, etc., by realizing the meaning of its passages. In other words, the validity of a sentence from the Vedānta lies within itself. And if this is to be doubted, what validity would there be for sentences in the Karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas which deal with sacrifices, but the fruits of which lie in the remote future and in regions like the heaven. The Karma-kāṇḍa creates in man a tendency to be active; the Vedānta puts an end to that.

So far, it has been shown that knowledge due to the statement regarding the Ātman is not the result of any activity or of any injunction concerning that activity. We now proceed to deal with another objection according to which the knowledge of the statement regarding the Ātman should be used for the doing of upāsana in order to realize the Ātman. For instance, a statement like, 'Knowing the Ātman one should constantly think

that he has realized the same', makes us aware that some kind of injunction is involved in the full realization of the Ātman. But this is not correct. Such statements do not indicate any extraordinary injunction, but are useful in being continuously aware of the Ātma-jñāna which has already been a fact of experience. Just as in the Karma-kāṇḍa we are told that the skin of the barley seed, which is already acquired for the purpose of being offered in a sacrifice, should not be peeled out by the finger-nails, but should be pounded out, even so the sentence, 'one should knowingly think himself to be Ātman' is meant to exclude the upāsana of the un-Ātman, and thereby to concentrate more and more on the Ātman who is already seen. So, even though the knowledge of the Ātman is realized, it must be remembered that so long as one has a body, senses, and mind, it is quite natural that on account of the great force of the Prārabdha karma, that is of that part of the accumulated effect of the past karma which has begun to fructify, one may lose the sight of the Ātman and begin to attend to objects and desires of saṁsāra only. An arrow that is released from the bow does not stop till it hits the target. Even so, the prārabdha which gets itself separated from the sañcita (accumulated past) runs its course with a force sometimes greater than that of the Ātma-jñāna. And so it is natural to think that so long as the prārabdha is not exhausted, jñāna also might appear as subservient to karma. Therefore, in order to counteract this possibility it is necessary that self-control, celibacy, Vairāgya, and renunciation have to be cultivated, even though the knowledge of the Ātman is already there.

Notwithstanding the recommendation of the Śruti that one should do the Upāsana of the Ātman as He is, and not as He appears partially as prāṇa, vāk etc., one very important point to be remembered is that the Ātman is neither limited by the word 'Ātman' nor does he ever fully become the object of realization. All the Śruti passages, such as 'Not this, not this' (Br. 2.3.6); 'By what means is it possible to know the knower' (2.4.14); 'Himself unknown, but knows all (3.8.12); 'From whom, being unable to know, return in despair the speech and the mind' (Tai.2.4.1), etc., mean only that the Ātman can never be the object of anything else. And yet, as the Upaniṣad tells us further, the Ātman alone is fit to be realized. The

region of the un-Ātman being the effect of the Ātman, the knowledge of it will necessarily be seen as being included in the knowledge of the cause which is none else but the Ātman. To find out this Ātman by one's own experience is just like finding out a lost cattle by tracing the foot-prints of that cattle, if only one has faith in his spiritual teacher and in the words of the seers which are known as the Śruti or the sacred scriptures. Therefore, though the latter can, in a sense, be said to be unreal when compared with the realization of the Ātman, they cannot be said to be useless since, like the foot-prints mentioned above, they will lead one to the discovery of the Ātman.

28. To realize the Ātman is to see Him in one's own form

This, however, does not mean that like the objects of the sensible world, the obtainment of the Ātman is altogether a new event in the life of a man. One does not possess first objects of his desires, but one strives and gets them afterwards. They are not there first; their obtainment, therefore, is altogether a new gain. The Ātman, on the other hand, is already there present in the bosom of every man, though this fact remains unknown till he is seen afterwards face to face in one's own form. This constitutes both the knowledge and the obtainment of the Ātman, and so, there remains then no difference between the knower and the known. To obtain the objects of desire in the sensible world, what is required is the person who desires, the object of desire, the means of obtaining that desire, and the activity suitable for the purpose. What is thus obtained is, however, a transitory gain and is wholly due to avidyā or ignorance of the Ātman, just as the knowledge of an unreal and transitory serpent on the rope is due to the ignorance about the existence of the rope. The only way, therefore to remove the ignorance is to have the knowledge of the real, that is, of the Ātman. And so, one who worships this Ātman derives in him the qualities of the Ātman. No wonder that he should be famous and be loved by all; or that he should be one with the Ātman and be liberated once and for all from the bondage of Saṁsāra. One, however, who has realized the Ātman does not care for the transitory gain of being famous or popular in the world. 7

Why the Ātman is said to be the dearest of all, and why not

any other object of desire is now being explained by the upaniṣad. No doubt progeny and wealth are dear to man; but they are all external to his being. Nearer than these are indeed, prāṇa, vāk, etc.; but they too are external to the being of man. What is innermost and closest or identical with his being is the Ātman only. Naturally, what remains steadfast, even though all the external things fall down, is the Ātman alone. So, the Ātman alone is and ought to be the dearest of all, and therefore every effort must be made for having the knowledge of the Ātman, even at the sacrifice of all other dear things in the world. And, therefore, one who realizes the Ātman becomes bold enough to say, to others who are after the objects of all other desires, that whatever they might get is perishable sooner or later. Why will such a man be attached to anything else in the world when he knows that nothing but the Ātman is ever-lasting? But the wonder of it is that one who realizes the Ātman does not altogether lose the objects of his other desires also. 8

29. *Wrong views of the Vṛttikāras and Bhartṛprapañca about the nature of Brahman*

What was told above in Kaṇḍikā sixth, namely, that 'one should worship the Ātman only' (Ātma iti eva upāsita) is now being brought in connection with what will be told henceforth, namely, the Brahma-vidyā which, however, is the only main topic of the whole of this Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad. That is why the Brāhmīns who were keenly listening to what was being narrated till now, became eager to know the nature of the Brahman, which was to them as if the yonder shore of the miserable ocean of Samsāra, and which they wished to cross by the help of the boat in the form of their spiritual teacher. The Brahmins therefore asked, 'What is that Brahman, knowing which people think that they would become the self of all? Did it know itself or something other than itself?' Śaṅkarācārya comments by saying that 'if all this is Brahman', is true, and if there is nothing else, it is obvious that the Brahman knew itself, and that this is the reason why 'one should know his Self' gets the necessary support. There can also be other answers to the question each of which, however, will be defective in some way. If Brahman might have become 'all' without

any knowledge, then others also can become so even if they be ignorant. But in that case, of what use would be the Brahma-vidyā? If it has become 'all' by knowing itself or something else, then its 'becoming all' is something which, like the fruits in karma-kāṇḍa, has to be accomplished by some means, and therefore is not there as an already accomplished fact. This means that it will be transitory only. Besides, it will involve the *regress ad infinitum*, since if something is dependent on something else, that else would depend on something else and so on. If we should believe that Brahman became 'all' in spite of its ignorance, but that we must have knowledge before we can become all, the scriptures would be inconsistent. Or, if we suppose that we also can become all without knowledge, then the scriptures will have no use for us. And, if as said above, we believe that to become the self of all is the result of knowledge, then, like the fruits of karma, that also will be perishable in nature.

But there will be no such effect of any kind. For, Brahman is, in fact, already the Self of all. It appears as if this is to be accomplished on account of the appearance of the unlimited Brahman as limited due to avidyā. The removal of the avidyā is itself the upādhi due to which the becoming of the Brahman as the Self of all appears as a super-imposition on the pure and unlimited Brahman. What is already a fact of experience without any particular object, is conceived as capable of being brought about in experience on account of the felt necessity of the removal from memory of all the traces of knowledge due to avidyā, and therefore of the removal of false objects of the external or the un-Ātmanic world. Hence it is that knowledge of Brahman and the scriptures which give us that knowledge will never be useless or perishable like the fruits of actions. 9

The question of the Brāhmins regarding the nature of the Brahman is now answered by the Upaniṣad and explained by the Ācārya after having first stated the opinions of the Vṛttikāras (commentators prior to Śankarācārya) and Bhartṛprapañca. While the reply of the Śruti is, 'All this was originally the Brahman; and the Brahman it was who saw himself, 'the Vṛttikāras think that Brahman here means the lower (apara) Brahman, that is the Prajāpati or the Hiranyagarbha. For, they point out that whereas becoming the Self of all is natural with

the Para Brahman, it is to be accomplished in the case of the Apra Brahman, by the study of the scriptures. But remembering what was told in an earlier Smṛti passage (Kaṇḍikā 1.4.2), namely, that the Prajāpati is also naturally endowed with jñāna, Vairāgya, Aiśvarya and Dharma, without his being instructed by any preceptor, others who follow Bhartṛprapañca hold the view that the word 'Brahma' in the above-quoted Śruti passage means neither the para nor the apra Brahman, but the puruṣa or jiva who, with the intention of attaining the highest spiritual good, has become disgusted with all the perishable objects of desire including even the enjoyments available to Prajāpati, and who has resorted to the study of the Brahma-vidyā. In other words, by 'Brahman' is meant the jiva with reference to his future condition of Brahma-hood, just as the word sannyāsin in 'one should accept the sannyāsa after giving the pledge that he will not be the cause of fear to anyone' means not the person who is actually a sannyāsin, but one who wishes to be so in the future.

But wrong is this view of Bhartṛprapañca, says Śankarācārya. For, to understand the word Brahman in any other sense except the highest (Para) Brahman, is to say that the jiva's being the Self of all is an artificial one, and as due to perishable means. Besides, what is meant by 'being the Self of all' is nothing but the cancellation of the superimposed wrong notions of the jiva, namely, 'I am not Brahman' and 'I am but limited by upādhis'. In fact, what is true of any jiva before he attains the status of Brahman consciously is that he is by nature nothing but Brahman and is therefore already the Self of all. It is wrong not to accept the primary meaning of 'Brahman' as the only entity of boundless excellence, and to accept an unknown meaning, namely, the jiva who is to become the Brahman in some future time. If the notions of the jiva that he is not the Brahman, and that he is not the Self of all, be said to be the natural characteristics of the jiva and not due to superimpositions of them on account of avidyā, then the very Brahma-vidyā will have no purpose to serve. It does not produce the Brahman, but removes the superimpositions of avidyā on it. Hence, it will be more than useless to interpret the word Brahman as meaning some jiva who is to become the Brahman. If there be no superimposition of silver on the shell, and if the

shell as shell is visible to the eye, what good will be achieved by proclaiming that it is shell and not silver? Even so, so long as there is the ignorance of Brahman, there would be some sense and usefulness of the instruction 'that (Brahman) thou (the jīva) art'. It is true that Brahman cannot be the cause of avidyā, nor can it be deluded, just as there can be no darkness in the Sun. No doubt there is nothing else but Brahman. But thereby the scriptural Brahma-vidyā cannot be said to be false or useless, so long as the jīva who is in reality non-different from Brahman is deluded by the wrong notion that he is not the Brahman.

30. *The Pūrva-pakṣa again*

The pūrva-pakṣa reappears in a different form. There are so many Śruti and Smṛti passages which tell us that Īśvara and jīva are different from each other. 'Karma and upāsanā follow the jīva after death' (Br. 4.4.2); 'the knower of Brahman becomes the Brahman' (Tai. 2.1.1); 'knowing Him, the jīva does not become contaminated' (Br. 4.4.2); 'one who departs from this world without knowing the Brahman becomes wretched and helpless, O Gārgi (Br. 3.8.10); 'one who is intelligent should know the Brahman and contemplate upon him' (Br. 4.4.21); 'Prajāpata is the bow, the Self is the arrow, and the Brahman is the target' (Mun. 2.2.4); 'Hunger and thirst do not afflict Him; Sinless and without old age and death is the Ātman' (Cha. 8.7.1); 'The Sun and the moon obey the orders of this immutable Brahman' (Br. 3.8.9); and so on. Kaṇāda, Akṣapāda Gotama and several other logicians hold with conviction that Īśvara is absolutely different from the transmigratory jīva. For, had there been no such difference what is the propriety of telling us the destination, the way of the gods, and the difference between the southern and the northern paths, or of the instruction regarding works and knowledge which will enable us to have prosperity and spiritual good? So, once again, the Pūrva-pakṣa asserts that the word Brahman refers to some jīva who is to become the Brahman in some future time.

31. *Refutation of the Pūrva-pakṣa*

But this is wrong, comes the reply again. For, in the first place, the works and knowledge of the saṁsāri jiva cannot lead him to the highest spiritual good. Second, supposing that such a jiva is capable of knowing that he is the Self of all, notwithstanding his being aware that he is a mere saṁsāri, the instruction regarding the knowledge of Brahman would be superfluous. When there are a number of passages as cited below which declare that the Ātman and the Brahman are one and the same, there is no necessity that one should first imagine that his self is the Brahman and then begin to worship the Brahman. 'This Ātman is the Brahman' (Bṛ. 2.4.6); 'From this Ātman has come into being the Ākāśa' (Tai. 2), etc. To suppose that there might be any other motive or fruit of the instruction about the knowledge of Brahman except the identity of Brahman with Ātman, is also not possible as is clear from the statements, 'the knower of Brahman becomes the Brahman' (Mu. 3.9.2); 'Thou hast attained, Janaka, the condition of fearlessness' (Bṛ. 4.2.4); 'Fearlessness itself is the Brahman' (4.4.25). It is impossible that one thing should have the attributes of another, even if it is imagined as being the same as the other. No scriptural statement has the power to produce in the Ātman the characteristics of the Brahman unless the Ātman is, without the exercise of any imagination, identical with Brahman. The statements are not the instruments of production; they only state the facts as they are, and prevent the falsehood to prevail. The statement about the entrance of Brahman in the body refers therefore to its presence there as the Ātman, and not to any other transmigratory soul, whether of the human being or of the Prajāpati or of Hiranyagarbha. Besides, mere imagination cannot serve the purpose of being a valid means of knowledge. In short, instruction about the knowledge of Brahman can never be construed as being a part of the supposition of the Ātman as Brahman, but that it is given with the view to making one understand that Brahman is the immanent, homogeneous and continual essence of everything, and the subject-matter of the whole of this as well as of all other Upaniṣads. This will be clear from what has been stated at the end of the Madhukāṇḍa (2.5), namely, 'this is all the instruction of the whole of the Vedānta', as also at

the end of the Muni-kāṇḍa, namely, 'this is all, O Maitreyi, the means of attaining immortality' 4.5.

Again, if the subject in the sentence 'one should know the Ātman only' were to be the Samsārī jivas, there would have been no such thing as Brahma-vidyā. There would have been only samsārī-vidyā. And what has been told immediately, afterwards, namely, 'I am the Brahman' clearly shows that the Ātman alone is the Brahman. This would be impossible, unless the knower (I or the Ātman) were the same as the known (Brahman). So just as both the light and darkness cannot be the attributes of the Sun, even so the real 'I' can never be interpreted as 'samsārī' as well as the Brahman, as one might choose him to be.

32. *Brahman as the eternal seer of Himself*

As regards the scope of the meaning of the word Brahman, it must be understood with reference to its nature which is, Jñāna incarnate. Though it is stated that 'the Brahman knew itself and became all,' it should not be understood that the statement means that Brahman is the subject or the object of the activity of knowing and that liberation lies in knowing this much about it. The scripture states that Brahman is ever liberated (nitya-mukta). So, it will not be proper to retain half of the statement as true and reject the other half as false. As there is no conscient or inconscient cause other than the Brahman which is one, non-dual and the only Reality, and as the whole of the saṁsāra is merely an imagined superimposition upon it, it will not be just to reject only a small portion of it as false. Before the superimposition or after it, Brahman was and is absolutely different from the created and the superimposed world as a whole. But when it entered into the body it became known as the Ātman doing all activities such as inhaling and exhaling of breath, etc. He became then as has been already shown, the seer, the hearer, the thinker, and the knower. Or, if one is not satisfied even with this definition of the Ātman then let one understand that the Ātman is the seer of the sight etc. and the spectator of all the activities. But, on this account, it should not be said that it is immaterial whether the Ātman is the seer of jar or whether he is the seer of the sight. For, there is a vast difference between the empirical seer of a jar,

and the transcendental seer of the non-sensuous intellect. The former is qualified by the upādhi of mind (antaḥkaraṇa) and its states, and is capable of undergoing modifications corresponding to them, while the latter is unmodifiable and is of the nature of Caitanya (Pure consciousness). When this transcendental seer therefore becomes himself the sight, how will it be possible for him, like the empirical seer to be conscious of things sometimes, and not to be conscious of them at other times? Therefore, he is eternally the seer of himself.

Are there then two sights, one invisible but eternal, and the other visible but shortlived? Yes, by all means. In the practical world, are there no people who can see and who are blind? And even in the case of those who have lost their sight, things become visible in a dream as clearly as they would be in the wakeful condition. This shows that the sight which people have in dreams is the natural sight of the seer. Hence, the Śruti says that the sight of the seer is never lost. In fact, this self-illuminational sight is the real nature of the seer; and so, there will be no contradiction if it is said that this eternal sight or the seer sees the ordinary, visible but shortlived sight of the world. There is none other than this eternal sight who can be called a seer, though this is unlike the opinion of Kaṇāda and others. It is this seer or the Ātman whom the Brahman knew as identical with itself. This is analogous to saying that heat is the nature of fire, meaning thereby, fire without heat is impossible to be understood by anyone. In the same way the Ātman or the Brahman can be called as the 'knower of the knower'; that is, there is no other knower except the Brahman. In other words, Brahman knows itself as the 'I' or the Ātman, and as the sight of the sight. As a corollary of this, the Upaniṣad tells us that whosoever from among the gods, the sages and men possesses the knowledge of the Ātman can be called a Jñānī, though from the viewpoint of the Brahman, there is no such distinction between gods and sages and men. For, it is Brahman which becomes as if bound by avidyā, and it is Brahman which becomes as if liberated from bondage. Thus it is that Brahma-vidyā becomes the means of liberation and of becoming the Self of all. It was in this manner that the sage Vāmadeva says that he was himself Manu. But this bliss of Brahman comes gradually like the satisfaction of the hunger of a man who takes his meals, morsel after morsel. The realization

of Brahman was not a special gift to the gods of the olden times, whosoever will not be tempted by the external objects of desire, nor deceived by the illusion of the false superimpositions on the Ātman on account of the avidyā, can realize the Brahman even in the present time. There will be absolutely no difference regarding the nature of the realization of Brahman between that of the very great sage, Vāmadeva of the olden times and that of any ordinary man of the present time. And even though man is believed to be indebted to sages, gods, and manes, and is expected to repay the debt by means of celibacy, performance of sacrifices and producing progeny, respectively, none of them will have any power to prevent him from realizing the Brahman.

33. *Even gods cannot bring obstacles in the way of those who seek to realize the Brahman*

Here arises the question whether gods and sages can bring obstacles in the way of obtaining the fruits of any kind of karma, or that of Brahma-vidyā only. To have a clear solution of these two problems, it is necessary to know the power of works (karma and the relation of gods with men. Those who believe in the 'Svabhāva-vāda' give the naturalistic explanation of all events in the world that they occur in the manner in which milk changes into curds. Such a belief not only brings into doubt the power and efficacy of time, karma, mantra, medicine, and penance, but also goes contrary to the general belief in causal connection, as well as against the experience of man regarding the inexplicable way in which happiness and misery come upon him. But everything will be accounted for, if it is believed that all the happenings in the world, including pleasure and pain, are the result of karma, and that no karma would take place and no fruit of it would be produced, unless time, place, and God are taken for granted as the accessories of karma. The bringing in of obstacles by gods, for instance, is also a karma which cannot therefore take place, unless there is prior to this karma some undesirable action or sin on the part of man. No doubt, an obstacle will be the cause of misery, but neither the misery nor the obstacle will ever occur unless there is as its cause a prior sinful action.

So, this much is certain that no karma can occur without the

co-operation of various other conditions, and that no god can bring any obstacle without being impelled by the force of the unseen result of the past karma of a man. It will be wrong to suggest that karma, time, place, unseen fate and gods behave in any manner they like. The real cause of the bewilderment of man is the difference of opinions among different schools of thought. The Mīmāṃsakas think that karma is the cause, some others think that fate is the cause, some think it is time or the nature of things, while some others say that it is the combination of these all. The scriptural texts, namely, Śruti and Smṛti think that man becomes sinful or meritorious according as his karma is sinful or otherwise.

As regards the reason why the gods cannot bring obstacles in the way of a man if he is trying to realize the Brahman is that there cannot be any interval of time between the knowledge and the realization of Brahman, during which the gods can bring obstacles. Just as the moment a lamp is lighted, darkness goes away, even so the moment the knowledge, that is the realization, of the Brahman is achieved, the false knowledge of avidyā is rooted out completely. Besides, as the knower of the Brahman becomes the Self of the gods, whom then will they be able to trouble? He will be the ideal for the gods to emulate and the object for their contemplation. How then can they wield any power over him? When the power of the Ātman is against them, they will utterly fail in their efforts to produce obstacles in the way of the realizer of the Brahman.

But there still remains the question as to what will happen if the Brahma-jñāna which arises in one moment of time does not last much beyond it, and if the mind is overcome once again by all sorts of illusions, likes, dislikes, pleasures, and pains. In such a condition what will be effective even in the case of one who has realized the Brahman? Will not his first moment of realization be the last? That is to say, it must be the last moment of his life which would bring liberation unto him, provided it is filled with the realization of Brahman. There will then be, in other words, videha-mukti (liberation after death) for him, and not Jivan-mukti (liberation while he is living). But, as there can be no definite proof or information whether or not the last moment of life will bring liberation along with Brahma-jñāna, and there being no special reason for choosing the first or the last moment for reali-

zation and liberation, the only alternative that remains open for being adopted as true is that there should be a continuous process or chain of such blessed moments. But this too is not possible to be had. For even the desire to satisfy hunger and thirst, will snap asunder the chain, and there will no longer be the continuous experience of 'I am the Brahman.'

34. *Brahma-jñāna destroys the sañcita Karma though not the Prārabdha*

All this, however, is an idle talk. For, whether the realization of the Ātman occurs in the first moment or in the last moment, whether or not it is continuous, if at all it is genuine, the destruction of avidyā must take place. It is true that even in the case of a realized person, false notions such as 'I am not the Brahman', 'I am happy', 'I am miserable', etc. intervene, and are not wiped out by vidyā. But this will happen so long as the body which itself is the result of past karma lasts. As has been already noted in kaṇḍikā seventh, the prārabdha karma which has begun to fructify with the birth of the body of a man will continue to play its role till death, just as an arrow which has been discharged from the bow will be in motion till it is not stopped by the target or by some other hindrance. Therefore notwithstanding the vidyā, the prārabdha shall run its own course till death. Vidyā does not cancel the prārabdha, though it puts a stop to that portion of the accumulated stock of the effects of past karma, (Sañcita), which has not begun to fructify. In short, neither the prārabdha nor the sañcita can ever arrest the emergence or the growth of Ātma-Jñāna.

What then is the difference between one who has realized the Brahman and one who has not, if on account of the presence of the prārabdha both of them suffer from the false and the illusory knowledge? The reply is that in the case of the person who has attained the Brahma-jñāna, there might be the prārabdha, no doubt, but there cannot be any false or illusory knowledge. For, once the rope is known as rope, there will be no more the illusion of a serpent on it, though there might occur the memory of it and the consequent shudder also. Even so, with the rise of the Brahma-jñāna, there can remain no other object which might be superimposed on it and cause an illusion.

It is only in the absence of correct knowledge about a thing that there occurs an illusion. There is first the vague, indeterminate knowledge about the rope that there is something lying on the ground. This general, indeterminate knowledge about the rope is confused with something which resembles the rope, namely, the serpent, and the wrong belief is produced that it is a serpent. But with the determinate knowledge of the rope, both the support of the illusory object, namely, the general, indeterminate knowledge of the rope, and the illusory serpent would vanish simultaneously. Similarly, with the emergence of the direct knowledge of the Brahman, both the support of the false appearances, namely, the ignorance of the Brahman and the phenomenal appearances would vanish simultaneously, though it is possible that the Brahma-jñānin might sometimes recollect his pre-illuminational life, and thereby experience also the false show of the world to that extent. It is seen that even a person who has got the correct knowledge about the directions, makes sometimes a confusion between the east and the west when he happens to be at night in a new place.

Our discussion so far that prārabdha may not be destroyed, in spite of the emergence of Brahma-jñāna, but that it has to be exhausted by being experienced till death is sufficient to dismiss the opinion that if liberation is due to Brahma-jñāna, there must occur the immediate fall of the body. "All his karma is destroyed;" (Mun. 2.2.8) 'for having Videha-mukti, he has to wait till the fall of the body' (Chā. 6.14.2); 'By realizing the Ātman, man is not affected by sins' (Br. 4.4.23); 'the sins he has committed or the meritorious deeds he has not done, do not afflict the realizer of the Ātman' (4.4.22); 'he who has realized the Brahman does not fear' (Tai. 2.9.1); what all such śruti passages show is that only the 'sañcita' karma of a realized person is destroyed.

35. *Gods are jealous of the realizer of the Brahman*

Similarly, what has been stated above, namely, that the realized person is indebted to gods, etc., is also wrong. One who is under the sway of avidyā will alone be indebted; for, it is only in the condition of ignorance, and not in that of knowledge, that the doing of actions is possible. Not knowing the Brahman, one

who worships other deities by devotional acts such as praises, salutations, offerings, etc., serves the gods and sages and the manes in the same way as the beasts serve the man. Whether it is the prosperity due to the doing of duties according to the rules of castes and āśramas, or the misery due to behaving contrary to scriptural injunctions, it is all the result of works done through ignorance or avidyā. In fact, the whole of this Upaniṣad as also other scriptures are meant to show the difference between vidyā and avidyā. Naturally, gods become able to confer their favours on those who worship them or bring obstacles in the way of those who do not realize the Brahman. Just as in the practical life, the loss of anyone of the many animals causes misery to the owner, even so gods are worried if anyone tries to leave away his beastly nature and becomes divine. 'All this celestial world', says the great sage Vyāsa, 'is filled by gods who had been deeply devoted to works only; therefore, O Arjuna, they do not like that the mortal beings should rise above them to the status of Brahman', and therefore it is that they bring obstacles in the path of men by depriving them of their fruits, etc., when they try to realize the Brahman. On the other hand, if the gods themselves wish to release a particular man, they confer upon him virtues like faith, contentment, etc. Hence it is that every one who wishes to do good unto himself should fear the gods, and should do all his duties which come unto him according to Varṇa and Āśrama, and should please them by doing all sorts of devotional acts with concentrated zeal and virtuous behaviour. 10

36. *The creation of Varṇas (castes)*

It is in the field of avidyā that duties according to Varṇa and Āśrama fall to the lot of a man who is not at all anxious to achieve the Brahma-vidyā, but is, on the contrary, immersed in saṁsāra. This is explained by the narration of the evolution of the world from Indra to the castes. All this was the non-dual Brahman in the beginning. But there being no differentiation in it, it was unable to produce any great work. So, it produced the warrior class, known as Kṣatriya, the heavenly representatives of which were Indra, Varuṇa, Soma, Rudra, Parjanya, Yama, Mṛtyu, and Īśāna. Naturally, as none else was superior to Kṣat-

riya, the Brahmin used to honour him in the Rājasūya sacrifice by standing below the seat of the Kṣatriya, and thereby conferring upon him his own Brahmanic power. Therefore, the Brahman (and therefore the Brahmin also) was considered as the source of the Kṣatriya caste. Hence, though the king is superior to all, he leans on the support of the Brahmins at the end of the Rājasūya sacrifice. And one who does not do so is said to destroy his own source of strength and thereby commit a great sin. This made the Brahman conscious of the imperfection of his creation. Therefore, he produced the Vaiśyas, the heavenly representatives of whom were Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas, Viśvedevas, and Maruts. With this even, the Brahman was not satisfied; he thought it was not perfect. So he produced the Śūdras, the chief among whom was the Pūṣan, that is, this very earth, suggesting thereby the function of the Śūdras, namely, that of ploughing the land and nourishing the life, in general. Thus, Brahman produced the four Varnas and yet he remained unsatisfied. He, therefore, produced Dharma (Law) which was meant to control even the most powerful Kṣatriya. That is why even an ordinary, weak person who is endowed with Dharma wishes to overcome a great adversary. This Dharma is none else but Truth; and so, one who is truthful is said to behave according to Dharma. 11-14

37. *The realizer of the Ātman will never grieve*

It was in the form of Agni (fire) that the Brahman became the Brāhmaṇa both among the gods and men. So, it is by offering oblations in fire that people wish to secure the heavenly fruits, and obtain their desired objects on this earth with the help of the Brāhmins. It is for the sake of doing the karma that the Brahman has produced the four castes. That same karma which is both the duty and dharma is able to keep in control all beings, and is able to achieve the end of human life. Notwithstanding this, one who departs from this world without knowing the Ātman, on account of his being puffed up with pride either because he has performed works connected with sacrificial fire, or because he has done specific duties of a Brahmin, can never be free from grief, infatuation and fear. Just as a person forgets to count himself as one of the ten persons, and counts only nine excluding himself and comes to grief as if one of them is lost,

even so the man immersed in desires and actions due to avidyā fails to realize himself as the Ātman. Let there be even a great soul (Mahātmā) who without knowing the Ātman, might perform many sacrifices like Aśvamedha, and let him accumulate very great merit; yet, all that will not last for ever, and will never save his soul. But one who worships the Ātman never grieves, even though the fruits of his good actions might perish in course of time. 'What do I lose,' says king Janaka, 'even if the whole of the city of Mithilā is on fire?'

Others like Bhartṛprapañca interpret this Śruti passage as meaning that the karma of one who has realized the Ātman does not perish at all. They agree in saying that the fruit of the upāsana of only the Hiraṇyagarbha, for instance, would diminish in course of time, because the status of Hiraṇyagarbha himself is achieved through karma only. But the karma of one who not only worships the manifest Hiraṇyagarbha but also the unmanifest Ātman cannot perish because the perishable is tagged on with the imperishable Ātman. But the reply would be that there is no scope for entertaining an imaginary distinction between the two lokas, one transitory of the manifest Hiraṇyagarbha, and the other eternal of the unmanifest Brahman or the Ātman. The word 'Sva' in 'Sva-loka' is equivalent to Ātman, and this is corroborated by 'Ātmānam eva lokam' which comes immediately afterwards. This means that the Śruti passage refers to one 'loka' only, namely, the Ātmaloka, and not to the lokas. Besides, in the passage, 'what have we to do with progeny; this Ātman is our loka'; and again, further, in the passage 'this loka of one who knows the Ātman does not perish by any kind of karma; this is his highest loka', the word 'Loka' has no other meaning except the Paramātmā. The worshipper becomes the Ātman; and whatever he might desire, he will get it by worshipping Him. But as there is nothing higher than the Ātman, and as there remains no desire which is not fulfilled, he does not wish to possess anything other than the Ātman. 15

Regarding the person who has no knowledge of the Ātman is engrossed in doing all sorts of activities according to castes and āśramas, the Upaniṣad tells us that he becomes an instrument only to satisfy some one or other of the beings; just as a beast becomes to a man. One who forsakes his ownership (Yāga) over a thing or offer oblations

in fire (homa) for the sake of a particular deity, and feels that in every way he is subservient to and dependent on that deity, obtains the proximity of that deity. One who does the daily routine of scriptural study obtains the proximity of the sages. One who offers food (piṇḍas or balls of cooked rice) and water in the name of his deceased fore-fathers, and desires and strives to have progeny, obtains the loka (region) of the fore-fathers. One who harbours worthy guests who come for shelter to his house, and gives them food, becomes certain of his having again the human birth. Similarly, one who gives grass and water to animals becomes endowed with cows and other domestic and useful animals. And, finally, one who satisfies other creatures like birds, insects, etc., with the view that he should repay the obligations of one and all, gets in return not only the best wishes of them all for his well-being, but also the protection from dangers and destruction at the hands of gods and sages. This is the fruit which he gets for performing the five kinds of sacrifices, namely the Bhūta-yajña, Manuṣya-yajña, Pitr̥-yajña, Deva-yajña and Brahma-yajña. It is this very protection given by gods, etc., that makes him feel secure and safe, and persuades him thereby to move through the same routine course of doing various activities of saṁsāra.

38. *The three 'eṣaṇās' (desires) and the fivefold sacrifice sum up the whole of Saṁsāra*

It seems therefore that there must be some other powerful reason on account of which man looks outside only to objects which are opposed to the nature of the Ātman, and becomes engrossed perforce as if, in saṁsāra. That reason, it might be said, must be avidyā. But the reply is that avidyā by itself is not the cause of making a man active; it hides the nature of Reality. Yet, it can be said that avidyā acts as the moving power of kāma or eṣaṇā (desire) which makes the man active. As the Kāṭhcopaniṣad says, 'men of little intellect go after the fulfilment of their desires, due to avidyā'; the Bhagavadgītā also (3.37) says the same, 'it is Kāma, which becomes Krodha (anger) afterwards, that moves a man to action'; Manu also holds (2.4) that 'whatever a man does is the action of Kāma'. All this is explained in detail at the end of this adhyāya. 16

In the beginning there was the Ātman only, and, there were no distinctions in him. Then, due to avidyā, there came upon him various superimpositions, such as body, mind, senses, and thereby he felt that he was the doer of actions, as also the instruments and the fruits of actions, according to castes and āśramas, and then being overcome by desire wished to have a female consort for him. Without wife, he thought he would not be fit for doing sacrificial duties. He then thought to become himself many in the form of offsprings, and to obtain wealth and pay off the debts of gods, etc., by doing such acts as would lead him to prosperity and Spiritual good. He had, however, no desire for doing routine or occasional karma; it was the desire motivated by kāma, and what it included was only wife, progeny, wealth, and karma. All this was for the sake of winning the three lokas of men, fathers and gods. Or, we might say that his 'eṣāṇā' (desire) took the twofold form or the desire for the three lokas, on the one hand, and for wife, progeny, wealth and actions, on the other. That one eṣāṇā, in other words, became for him both the means and the end to be achieved, just as by having a dinner, one satisfies one's hunger and also gets the pleasure of eating.

Driven by this eṣāṇā the man of the ordinary, practical life becomes a slave to it, and thereby weaving a web of desires round him, gets so much entangled in it that he is never inclined to have a look at the Ātma. As the Taittirīyopaniṣad says, 'one who thinks that the sacrificial fire, and not the knowledge of the Ātman, shall bring well-being unto him, will attain to the condition of smoke after his death, but will never reach the Ātman'. This is not simply the description of the destiny of an unthinking man; it sums up the destiny of the whole of the creation of Prajāpati, inasmuch as the Prajāpati himself, as we have already seen (4.3), became afraid of being alone and wished to have a woman as his wife. Naturally, one remains ever dissatisfied so long as one does not obtain anyone of the desired objects, namely, wife, progeny, and wealth. With all this imperfection, one imagines oneself to be perfect by considering that one's mind itself is one's Ātman, since all one's senses and body follow in accordance with the wishes of one's mind. Even, wife, progeny, etc., are for the fulfilment of his mind's desires. In this connection, the Upaniṣad suggests that speech (vāk) is

the wife of mind; for, it is by the means of the ear that the mind understands and accepts the vāk and retains it as wife. From mind and speech comes forth the offspring in the form of Prāṇa. The eye which is necessary to see the forms of things like cows, horses, etc., constitutes the human wealth. No doubt there is another kind of wealth, namely, the knowledge (Vijñāna). But as this is understood by means of the ear, it is said that the ear itself is this wealth. Now that the three are there, namely, wife, progeny, and wealth, what is the nature of the fourth, namely, of the Karma? That also is imaginary. It is known as the Karma of Yajña. For, just as the actual Yajña is performed by five persons, namely, four priests and the Yajamāna (the performer of the sacrifice), even so this internal one is performed by mind with the help of the four entities mentioned above, namely, wife, progeny, wealth and activity.

(Here ends the fourth Brāhmaṇa of the Adhyāya First of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣād.)

ADHYĀYA FIRST: BRĀHMAṆA FIFTH

The topic of Avidyā is not still over. The upāsana which makes distinction between the worshipper and the worshipped is also the effect of avidyā. As in the earlier creation, so in this also every being who has been the doer of action, whether enjoined or prohibited, is to be recognized as the creator of his own world of avidyā, as also the effect of it. Prajāpati therefore need not be considered as the only creator. The whole world as also every jiva in it are reciprocally related to each other as cause and effect. It is this secret about the world and the man, which we shall explain later on in the Madhu-vidyā when we shall deal with the knowledge of the unity of the Ātman. For the present, we shall see how the jiva as the performer of 'homa', 'yāga', etc., has created this world and divided it into seven parts known as the seven kinds of food. Thus considered, every jiva, so far as his karma and knowledge are concerned, can be treated as the progenitor of the world. The following are the mantras of that food; it is they which tell us what kind of food it is and how it is to be used.

39. *To eat the food without giving it to others is to eat sin*

Out of the seven kinds of food which he produced, one is the common food which is eaten by all beings. Two other kinds he distributed among gods; three others for himself, and one to the beasts. What is known as the ordinary food is not meant for one individual only; it ought to be given to others also. But one who does not do so never becomes free from sin. For, He becomes interested in nourishing his body only, and makes no use of that food for any benevolent purpose. Therefore it is said, 'one should not prepare food for oneself only'. It is but natural that others also would like to eat the food that we eat. So, every morsel of the food that is eaten without a portion of it being given to others, is a kind of sin which resides in the food.

As regards the two kinds of food which are offered to gods, one is what is offered in the fire, known as 'huta', and the other is what is offered as oblations to all creatures known as 'Pra-huta', or 'Baliharāṇa'.

To the beasts, he gave one food, whether they are two-footed (including men) or four-footed. That food is the milk.

Thus we have to remember that there has been a constant chain of cause and effect on account of which, like a continuous stream of water, the food also is never exhausted. But, like the flowing water of a stream, like the flame of a lamp, like the foam on water, or like a dream or a mirage, all this multifarious saṁ-sāra, consisting of intellect and karma, means and ends, actions and fruits, is momentary and impure. Those, however, who are inextricably attached to it, who are accustomed to look outside only, think that it is eternal, real, and unmodifiable, because the interests, desires and actions of innumerable beings who happen to come together are intertwined, without any hope of being disentangled. The scriptures tell this fact again and again, because their motive is that man should become disgusted with it, and seek to possess the Brahma-vidyā which, the present Upaniṣad will describe in the fourth and the next two adhyāyas. For the present, in the context of the food, what we have to remember is that in spite of the food being constant, a thoughtful person should eat the food not by being a slave to it, but by being the owner and the controller of it. 2

40. *Speech, Mind and Prāṇa, considered as food*

As for the three remaining foods, namely mind, speech and prāṇa, they are the best among all, and are meant by the progenitor for himself alone. In the first place, it should be noted that mind is quite distinct and separate from the Ātman and the senses. For, even when the senses are in close contact with the objects, the mind is not perceived though it is necessary as a separate and distinct instrument to make knowledge possible at all. If the mind is not in contact with a particular sense, the knowledge due to that sense does not arise. 'My mind was elsewhere', they say, and so, they explain why they have not seen an object or not heard a sound. It has various functions, such as to desire, to imagine, to doubt, to have faith, to disbelieve, to show courage or the want of it, to feel shame, to fear, and to think. Besides, it has the unique power of discrimination which the senses do not possess. For instance, the skin can apprehend the sensation of touch, but will not be able to discriminate definitely between the touch by the hand and that by the elbow.

Vāk or the speech consists of words and sounds. A word, whether it is palatal, dental, etc., is, no doubt, a sound; while the sound also may be a kind of word. The sound might be reduced to alphabet and then written or spoken as one would wish. But it may not consist of alphabet; for instance, the rumbling sound or the thunder of a cloud, or the sound produced by beating a drum or of blowing wind through a pipe. The function of speech is to follow the meanings of words and to make them manifest and understandable.

As for the prāṇa, the Upaniṣad tells us, that it means the wind which goes out of the mouth and the nostrils. Apāna is that wind which drives down the urine and excreta. It is located in the region between the heart and the navel. Between the prāṇa and the apāna there is the wind which is known as Vyāna. It controls both of them and is the cause of valour and activity. Udāna is that wind which travels upwards from the feet to the head, and which departs from the body at the time of death, but which is the cause of nourishment and vitality so long as there is life in the body. Samāna is that which digests food and water, and so it resides in the stomach. All these five prāṇas, however, go by the same general name 'Prāṇa', as it comes from the root 'an'

to breathe. Thus, in short, the prāṇa, the speech and the mind as discussed above, go to form the nature of a saṁsāri jīva. This, in other words, is the Adhyātmika description of manas, vāk and prāṇa. 3

Now begins the description of the Adhibhautika extent of the same food known as Prajāpati. Speech, mind and prāṇa are the very three worlds (lokas) which have been known as Bhūḥ, Bhuvaḥ and Svah. Speech is this very earth (Bhūḥ); mind is the world just above the earth (Bhuvaḥ); and prāṇa is the heaven (Svah). Then, they are Ṛgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda, respectively. And then, whatever is distinctly and clearly known is due to speech only; for, speech alone can communicate the meaning of words to others, and recognize by means of voice one's friends and relatives. Speech thus becomes the food. Similarly, whatever causes doubt but creates the desire to know the real is due to the nature of mind only. This too can be said to be the mental food in the form of inquisitiveness, and is necessary for the well-being of man. Similarly, whatever is unknown, that is, whatever is neither doubted nor known clearly, is of the nature of prāṇa; which also is necessary to protect the men by being their food, though one who knows rightly becomes highly useful in practical life; and though one who knows not, or one who doubts is not necessarily considered as useless. For instance, a disciple who cannot fully appreciate the obligations of his spiritual teacher, or a boy who is indifferent to his parents' obligations are often excused or fondled. Even so, the doubting mind and the ignorant prāṇa become also serviceable to man. 4-10

The Upaniṣad now begins with the description of the Adhidai-vika nature of vāk, mana and prāṇa. Earth is the external support of the speech, and the flaming light of fire on this earth is its instrument. This means that Prajāpati's vāk is of a double nature. In one sense, it is like the earth the non-illuminated support only of whatever is spoken; in another sense, it is like the fire the illumined instrument of making it understood.

Regarding the mind, the celestial world is its body, and this shining Sun is the instrument of its manifestation. Out of the contact of the two was born the Prāṇa-Vāyu, who is none else but Indra or the highest God without any rival. That Prāṇa is the Prajā or the offspring of Mana and Vāk is also true. The rays of the Sun (Āditya) coming down from above, and the flames of

the Fire (Agni) shooting upward's must have met somewhere in the mid-region between the earth and the heaven. The birth of this Prāṇa (Vāyu) is for the purpose of doing activity. But the peculiar feature of this offspring is that he has no rival, though its source, namely, Vāk and Mana can be interpreted in more than one way. 11-12

41. *The three foods constitute the perishable world of Prajāpati*

Leaving aside this aspect of prāṇa in the sense of prajā, the prāṇa understood in the sense of food of Prajāpati is supported by water as its body; and by the shining moon as the instrument of activity. This means that prāṇa occupies the entire body with its activity. So the entire field of the Adhyātma and Adhibhūta world is covered by the three kinds of food, namely, Vāk, Mana, and Prāṇa. And these three constitute the Prajāpati, and so, they are infinite and immanent in all the creatures, and will last till the end of saṁsāra. One who worships this Prajāpati as consisting of limited worlds enjoys them till they perish; but one who worships them thinking that they are unlimited becomes the self of them all. 13

The Upaniṣad proceeds to narrate that this Prajāpati in the form of food can be understood as forming the 'Saṁvatsara' (year). He then becomes known as 'Kālātmā', that is endowed with time as his self, and consists of fifteen digits (Kalās), that is, fifteen days and nights known as 'Tithis'. Digit by digit, he increases in the bright half of the month and becomes perfect on the full moon day (Pūrṇimā). And then digit by digit, he decreases every night in the dark half of the month and becomes invisible on the new-moon day (Amāvasyā). But on that day, he remains still endowed with one imperishable kalā, which we may call as the sixteenth kalā, and with that nourishing sap he enters into all the movable and immovable world. Even then, it must be remembered that the activity of the Prajāpati is 'Pāṅkta'. The Dyuloka, Āditya and Mana as Father; Pṛthivī, Agni and Vāk as Mother; Prāṇa as progeny and the digits of the moon as the perishable wealth are all the cause of the karma, namely, the creation of the world. It is this which constitutes the Pāṅkta nature of the Prajāpati. As for the Amāvasyā day when the moon is said to enter into all the

creatures, we are told that no creature, not even a lizard, be killed on that day. 14

This Saṁvatsara Prajāpati, however, need not be said to exist in an invisible manner; for, he is the same person who is made up of food as mentioned above. Whatever wealth such as cows, horses, etc., belong to him are his fifteen kalās, and it is with this increasing or decreasing wealth that he executes his karma. His Ātman in the form of his physical body constitutes his sixteenth kalā, and like the moon, therefore, he becomes full of wealth, or deprived of it. In other words, his body is like the nave of a wheel, in which are fixed like the spokes and rim of the wheel all his wealth and other belongings; and so, even if he be deprived of them, he can get them back. Thus, in a general way, we have learnt that progeny, karma, and knowledge of this phenomenal world would only result in obtaining the other equally perishable worlds also, including the status of the Prajāpati. The next kaṇḍikā, would therefore, tell us about the specific relation which exists between the progeny and other means and the worlds to be obtained thereby 15-20

42. *To attain immortality, be in the company of Prāṇa and Vāyu*

In Kaṇḍikā thirteen, it was told in a general way, that Vāk, mana, and prāṇa go to form the upāsana. Now is mentioned the specific aspect of it. It has been noticed that Prajāpati created speech and other senses for the purpose of doing all the activities. But as soon as they were created; there arose rivalry among them. Speech insisted that it would continue to speak and speak unceasingly; the eye and the ear insisted respectively upon seeing and hearing without ceasing, and so on. Other senses also did the same with reference to their functions. But death seized them all and prevented them from doing their respective functions. So, since then, even today, speech, eye, ear and other senses become fatigued after some time. Prāṇa alone could not come under the influence of death. Seeing that prāṇa is neither fatigued nor perished, in spite of his unceasingly going in and coming out of the mouth and nostrils, the senses thought he was the chiefest among them all, and therefore following him became known by the same name of 'Prāṇa'. Thus, one who knows that all the senses live on account of

Prāṇa and knows the importance of Prāṇa, becomes so much famous that his entire family would become known after him, just as all the senses have become known by the name 'Prāṇa'. But those who become the rivals of prāṇa die a miserable death. 21

What has been thus described as the Adhyātmika aspect of prāṇa will be presently used for the purpose of making clear the Adhidaivika aspect of it. As before, here also, the different deities of Agni, Āditya, and the Moon began to insist respectively that they would unceasingly burn, scorch, and shine. The lightning and the other deities also did the same, the deity of Wind alone could not be conquered by death, just as other deities were. Naturally, one who has attained by his upāsana the form of Prāṇa and that of Vāyu, will not be destroyed. In this very sense, there comes the final mantra of this Brāhmaṇa informing us that out of Adhidaiva Vāyu arises the Sun and into that Vāyu again he sets in the evening; or, out of the Ādhyātmika prāṇa the Sun comes forth in the form of the eye, and sets again during sleep. Therefore, it was that the deities of fire and other elements followed and worshipped the Vāyu and the deities of Vāk and other senses followed and worshipped the Prāṇa. The same is being done by all these deities at present and will be done by them in the future also. But, after all what is being done by all the senses and the deities of fire, etc., is short-lived, as is clear from the fact that it is dissolved in Prāṇa or Vāyu. What is not shortlived is the constant motion of the Vāyu and the Prāṇa. Therefore, what one should do is to cease to take interest in the working of the senses, and try to be always in the company of the Vāyu and Prāṇa, lest he should be overtaken by death. And it is this practice of the renunciation of interest in the activities of the senses which should be carried on till death. This means that one should always try to get himself identified not only with the Prāṇa which is unceasingly working in himself, but also with the Vāyu which is working in all other beings. This is the way of being identified with the Prāṇa, or of being approximately assimilated with it; or, what is the same thing as getting Sāyujyatā (oneness) or Salokatā (being in one place) with Prāṇa. 22-23

(Here ends the fifth Brāhmaṇa of the Adhyāya first of the
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad)

ADHYĀYA FIRST : BRĀHMAṆA SIXTH

43. *Turn away from the perishable names, forms and actions which make up the Samsāra*

Now comes in this Brāhmaṇa a brief retrospect and conclusion of the whole of the effect of avidyā which has been described so far. All this manifested, visible world including the glorious achievement of being identified with Prāṇa is infected with avidyā; for, even before the manifestation of the world, what existed in the form of the seed of it was the triad of Nāma, Rūpa, and Karma (name, form and action). This constitutes the anātman, and not the Ātman or the direct realization of the Brahman. One who wishes to be liberated should think of leaving the world of un-ātman with disgust; for, one whose mind does not turn away from the anātman can never be inclined to be attached to Ātman, since the sense organs have got the innate tendency to look at the outside world, and not at the Ātman inside. As the Kathopaniṣad says (2.1.1), 'rare is the person who takes courage, and turning away from the objects of the sense sees the Ātman.'

As for the apprehension of the various forms and colours, it is the eye which is the cause of it; it is the eye which looks equally to them all, and retains them all. Similarly, all the various actions are done and supported by the body. Similarly, again it is from Vāk that all the words are produced; and since names are nothing but words, Vāk is the cause of all names such as Yajñadatta, etc. In short, whether it is name, form, or karma, it is the universal which bears in it all the particulars, the cause which produces the effects, just as it is the earth out of which are produced the jars. And just as the jars are not different from the earth which is their cause, even so the names, forms, and actions can never be different from speech, eye, and body respectively. 1-2

Notwithstanding their being three in number, Nāma, Rūpa, and Karma are all, in a sense, one only. For, they are mutually dependent on each other; mutually do they cause the existence of each other, and are dissolved into each other. If there is no perceptible form of any object, there can be no name of it; nor can there be any action with reference to that object. This

means that nāma and karma are dependent on rūpa. Similarly, rūpa in its turn is dependent on nāma and karma. The word (nāma) and its meaning (rūpa) involve each other, and both require the aid of action for being pronounced and known, while the action, to be appropriate, is dependent upon the word and its meaning. This means that the three are mutually interdependent. When, however, the name is there, it includes in it the rūpa; when the rūpa is perceptible, separate mention of the name need not be considered as indispensable. Similarly, when an action is there, it can be understood that it is in connection with some namable object. In short, this triad is united together by the body which is one on account of its senses and all other limbs taken together, just as, in Kaṇḍikā three of the fifth Brāhmaṇa the body was shown to be at once made up of food, mind, and Prāṇa. In other words, this triad of nāma, rūpa, and karma is all that constitutes the manifested saṁsāra and its unmanifested seed.

44. *Ultimately Prāṇa also is not the Ātman*

Naturally, the Ātman, meaning thereby this physical body which is the complex of cause and effect, and which has its three aspects of Adhyātma, Adhibhūta, and Adhidaiva, has become all that is known as nāma, rūpa, and karma. What is immortal in the body and what supports it is the Prāṇa, which does not perish even if the body perishes. What exists on account of the body, namely, nāma and rūpa, that is, all this phenomenal existence made up of the five elements having names and forms, exists because it is supported by prāṇa. And yet, being itself the very subtle cause and of the nature of anātman, the prāṇa becomes incapable of being discerned, inasmuch as it is hidden by the physical, gross body. If then what is anātman cannot be discerned because it is covered by nāma and rūpa, how can the Ātman who is covered by this anātmika prāṇa be seen directly at all? It is on this account, that the next three adhyāyas are intended to make clear the nature of the Ātman. 3

(Here ends the sixth Brāhmaṇa as also the first Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SECOND : BRĀHMAṆA FIRST

45. *The Ātman as the subject-matter of Vidyā*

The Ātman alone should be meditated upon; the Ātman alone should be searched, so that all else would be known; the Ātman alone being the dearest of all other objects is the only fit object which should be discovered, the Ātman alone is known to be the same as Brahman. All these statements make it abundantly clear that the Ātman alone is the subject-matter of Vidyā. On the other hand, the subject-matter of avidyā is shown to involve the distinction between the knower and the known, 'One who sees manifoldness travels from death to death' (Br. 4.4.19). What we find in all the Upaniṣads therefore is that vidyā and avidyā have been shown as absolutely different from each other. It was with the view to showing the subject-matter of avidyā that the preceding first adhyāya was devoted to the description of the various distinctions such as the means and the ends to be achieved. That subject-matter, as we have seen, is twofold. One is the internal prāṇa which is said to be the immortal support of all, and the other, the external, so-called real and the perceptible world which comes into being and is destroyed. It is by this latter mortal world that the prāṇa is covered, and it is on account of it that the external world is variously known as Virāt, Vaiśvānara, Ātmā, Prajāpati, Hiranyagarbha, etc.

Thus it is that the Brahma, that is, the entire creation, is both one and many. It is both the doer and the enjoyer, and the conscious element in all the different bodies. Thinking wrongly that the avidyā itself constitutes the core of the Ātman, a certain Brahmin, by name Gārgya, comes forward as the exponent of the Brahma-vidyā, and Ajātaśatru who has realized the Ātman as one who listens to what is being told. Thus begins a fictitious story in which the two persons represent the Pūrvapakṣa and the Siddhānta, in order to impress upon the minds of the readers the truth which can hardly be done by logical arguments. As the nature of the Ātman is extremely subtle and difficult to be realized (Ka. 1.2.7, 9) except by those whose intellect and mind are sharp and pure, it has to be gained, through the spiritual teacher (Chā. 4.9.2; 6.14.2) who having realized it would alone be able to impart it to others (B.G. 4.34). Here, in this Upaniṣad

also, the extremely difficult Brahma-vidyā will be very beautifully described during the course of a dialogue between Śākalya and Yājñavalkya (3.9.1-2, 8). To have faith is considered as one of the best means of obtaining Brahma-vidyā (B.G.4.39)! and this will be clear from what we shall know about Gārgya and Ajātaśatru in the allegory.

46. *The proud Gārgya describes several Puruṣas*

There was a Brahmin by name Balāki, son of Balākā and born in the family of Gārgya. He was a good orator, but proud on account of his having known the subject-matter of avidyā which is the opposite of the Brahma-vidyā. He met Ajātaśatru Kāśī-rāja and asked him if he would like to learn Brahma-vidyā from him. Ajātaśatru immediately replied, 'even for saying this much, I shall give you a thousand cows. For, people who wish to describe the nature of Brahman and to hear about it run to Janaka with the belief that he is the only person who would like to discuss about the Brahman and that he is a great donor. Perhaps you are thinking the same about me'. 1

Gārgya then told him, 'I myself worship the Puruṣa who is seen in the Sun and in the eye as the Brahman. He enters into the heart and behaves as the doer and the enjoyer of all. Him do I worship in this very body which is endowed with senses.' Whereupon Ajātaśatru asked him 'not to say anything further about that Brahman, I know this all, it transcends above all beings like the head over the body and is endowed with lustre; he appears as if he is the king of all. I know also the kind of fruit which the worshipper gets. He transcends all beings and becomes the King.' 2

Thereupon Gārgya told that he worshipped the Puruṣa who is seen in the Moon, and who resides in the mind of man as the Brahman and as the doer and enjoyer of all. Ajātaśatru replied that he need not talk about him any more, since he knew it all, and since he himself worshipped that moon who is known as the great king Soma, who wears a white garment, and who is identical with the Soma-valli whose juice is drunk in a sacrifice. He further said that he also knew that one who worships the moon never feels the want of food. 3

'That shining Puruṣa in the lightning, who is also in the

heart, is the Brahman, and I worship him as such', said Gārgya. 'No, do not talk about that Brahman. I myself worship him, and I know that one who worships him becomes himself lustrous and is endowed with lustrous offsprings', replied Ajātaśatru. 4

'In the sky above and in the heart, there is seen one Puruṣa. Him I worship as Brahman,' said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about him; I worship him as possessing the qualities of perfection and actionlessness, and I know that one who worships him becomes endowed with progeny and cattle, and that they are not destroyed soon,' replied Ajātaśatru. 5

'There is a divinity in vāyu, prāṇa and heart. Him I worship as Brahman,' said Gārgya. 'No, do not discuss about him; I worship him as Indra, Vaikuṇṭha, and as the invisible army, and I know,' said Ajātaśatru that 'one who worships him as I do, becomes victorious over others and is never defeated by them.' 6

'There is a divinity in fire, speech and heart. Him do I worship as Brahman,' said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about him; I worship him as one who has got the quality of endurance, since fire has the quality of devouring the oblations which are thrown in it. And I know that one who worships him will have this enduring fire kindled in him and in his offsprings to a great extent,' said Ajātaśatru. 7

'There is a divinity in water, semen and the heart. Him do I worship as Brahman,' said Gārgya. 'No, do not talk about him; for, I worship him as the Image, and I know that one who worships him thus will not only be worshipping him in accordance with what is laid down in Śruti and Smṛti, but will resemble him', said Ajātaśatru. 8

'There is a divinity in the mirror, in other reflecting objects like a sword and in the heart which is pure. Him do I worship as Brahman', said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about him; I worship him as resplendence; and I know that one who worships him thus becomes resplendent himself,' said Ajātaśatru. 9

'There arises a sound when the wind blows. I combine that sound with prāṇa which upholds life, and him I worship as Brahman,' said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about him; I too worship him as prāṇa, and I know that one who worships him will never be deprived of it before he is destined to die at a parti-

cular time, even though he is overcome by diseases,' said Ajātaśatru. 10

'There is divinity in the quarters, in the two ears and in the heart. Him do I worship as Brahman,' said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about that divinity, Aśvinikumāra; for, I too worship that twin-divinity who is inseparably one. And I know that one who worships this divinity will never be separated from him,' said Ajātaśatru. 11

'In the darkness outside, in the ignorance which covers the body, and in the heart there is a divinity. Him I worship as Brahman', said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about him; for I worship him as Death, and I know that one who worships him is not overcome by any disease and lives the full life that is possible for a person in this mortal world,' said Ajātaśatru. 12

'There resides a divinity in the Ātman (Prajāpati) in the intellect and in the heart; and him I worship as Brahman', said Gārgya. 'Do not talk about him; I worship him as "Ātmanvi" that is, as having in him the Ātman. And I know that one who worships him becomes endowed with great intelligence, and that his progeny also become intelligent like him,' replied Ajātaśatru. Thus, when, one after another, whatever claim was put forth by Gārgya regarding the knowledge of Brahman, was refuted by Ajātaśatru, and when there could not come any fresh claim, Gārgya became silent and hung down his head with shame. 13

47. *Unlike Prāṇa, the Ātman is both conscious and bhoktā.*

Thus, seeing Gārgya sitting silent and dejected, Ajātaśatru asked him if his knowledge of Brahman was that much only, or if he had something else to say. And on hearing that Gārgya had nothing to say, Ajātaśatru said to him again, 'why have you become so proud? Brahman cannot be realized by simply knowing what you know. I shall impart that knowledge to you'. What Ajātaśatru meant was that all those kinds of Brahman about whom Gārgya had knowledge were only the subject-matter of *avidyā*, and so had become the objects of worship of *nāma* or *rūpa* or *karma*. When Gārgya also was convinced of this, he told Ajātaśatru that he had surrendered unto him as a disciple. And though Gārgya was a Brahmin, and Ajātaśatru a non-Brahmin, there was nothing wrong in doing so, as the

Dharma-śāstra allows it so far as the obtainment of Brahma-vidyā is concerned. 14

Thinking, however, that it is improper that a Brahmin who is capable of being a teacher should approach a Kṣatriya for being instructed in the Brahma-vidyā, Ajātaśatru held his hand and got up along with him. Both of them came then near a person who was sleeping. And, then in order to wake him up, Ajātaśatru called him by addressing him, 'O great King, O Soma, O you who are dressed in white garment;' but the sleeping man did not wake up. Thereupon Ajātaśatru moved him by his hand and woke him up. This shows that though the prāṇa of the sleeping man was active during sleep, he did not hear the calls of Ajātaśatru, and that therefore he could not be thought of as doer and enjoyer, even though Gārgya was considering him as Brahman.

A question arises in this connection as to why it was necessary for Ajātaśatru to go near a sleeping person to prove what Gārgya thought about Brahman was wrong. Why did he not prove it in the case of a waking person by showing the difference between his own view and that of Gārgya? The reply is that in the wakeful condition, as the activity of prāṇa is mingled with that of the sense-organs, it could not have been isolated from that of the senses, and the real nature of prāṇa could not have been ascertained. In the sleeping condition, as the senses are inactive, and as the prāṇa alone is active, we get the opportunity of comparing the two conditions of prāṇa, one in which he is mingled with the senses, and the other in which he is dissociated from them. In both the conditions, the prāṇa is, no doubt, active. But whereas in the wakeful condition the prāṇa as the enjoyer is the seer, but not the object of thought; during sleep, he is no longer the enjoyer, but becomes the object of thought. Therefore, it became necessary for Ajātaśatru to approach a sleeping person and convince Gārgya that the prāṇa whom he was supposing as Brahman was not at all the bhoktā (enjoyer).

Besides, there is no possibility of misunderstanding whether the prāṇa meant by Gārgya was the same to whom Ajātaśatru had addressed by various names or, as the Puruṣa said to be Brahman by Gārgya and as having the same characteristics which Ajātaśatru mentioned while addressing the sleeping man. They are, 'prāṇa as covered by truth', 'whose body consists of water', and so, who is named as 'one whose garment is, white';

who is 'great (br̥han) on account of there being no enemy'; who is the 'King Soma', having 'sixteen Kalās', and who is also known as the Moon. If this prāṇa, as accepted by Gārgya were the bhoktā, he would have definitely heard the calls. But inasmuch as the prāṇa did not hear, it means that he lacks consciousness and therefore cannot be the bhoktā. Nor should it be supposed that prāṇa did not respond to the calls even though he might have heard them, because he was not sure whether the names of the qualities, such as 'Brahman', 'soma', etc., were really meant for him or for any other soul in the body, just as a man in a crowd, not knowing whether the name-by which he is called is meant for calling him alone or some other person, does not respond till he is satisfied even though he might hear the name. For, there should be no such uncertainty in the mind of prāṇa since the presiding deity of prāṇa is the Moon, and the prāṇa in the body is supposed to be bhoktā. It is expected of the deity that he should know that the names used in addressing the prāṇa really belonged to him; otherwise, there would be no meaning in worshipping the deity in the form of prāṇa by various devotional acts, such as prayers, praises, salutations, etc., and in saying that the deity becomes pleased thereby.

48. *Objections against the incapacity of Prāṇa, considered*

One might say that if the prāṇa is both 'anātman and a-bhoktā' (inconscious and incapable of having experience), then it would equally be true of the Ātman who is said to be different from the prāṇa. For, as the Ātman is said to be both bhoktā and conscious, he ought to have responded to the calls. But as this has not happened, there is no meaning in saying that the Ātman is different in nature from the prāṇa. It is however wrong to argue in this way, and try to show that the Ātman also, like the prāṇa, is equally inconscient and incapable of having experience. The Ātman whose knowledge Ajātaśatru wished to impart to Gārgya is not specifically concerned with being conscious of a particular limb of the body, such as hand or foot or with prāṇa alone, but has its contact with the whole of the body. Naturally, just as when a limb of the body is being called, for instance, if one cries out, 'O my hand, O my leg,' the Ātman does not respond, similarly when the prāṇa was called, the Ātman did not respond.

even though he is conscious and bhoktā. Besides, there is a difference between the Ātman who identifies himself with the body, and the Ātman who does not identify either with the body or with prāṇa, but is ever transcendent, unmodifiable, and self-conscious.

To ward off the defect of the incapacity of prāṇa to have the experience of any kind, another objection comes forward for consideration. It is pointed out that it is not necessary that the Ātman alone should be the bhoktā. It is commonly observed that even an ordinary man does not become conscious during sleep when he is called out by his personal name, such as Devadatta, for instance. Even so, it is conceivable that prāṇa might not have been able to hear the calls in spite of his being a bhoktā. But this is not correct. For, while the jīva, that is, the Ātman as conditioned by the body, does go into sleep, prāṇa does not. And it is on account of this, that the senses of the jīva are overcome by prāṇa that is they are merged in prāṇa. But if we suppose that prāṇa is the bhoktā because he keeps awake, then it follows that not the jīva but he is, as if, the master of the body, and in that case, it will be wrong to suggest that the senses which are, as if his servants should go to sleep. And if, on the other hand, both the prāṇa and the senses are active in sleep, then it will obviously be wrong to say that it is the condition of sleep. So, the conclusion is that neither the jīva nor senses become aware of anything during sleep.

Changing the argument one might say that prāṇa did not become aware because he was not called by the usual names such as 'prāṇa', 'apāna', etc. but by the unusual names such as, 'Bṛhan', 'Soma', 'King', etc. But this is not correct. For, the new names are not absolutely irrelevant. They were used by Ajātaśatru to refute the wrong belief that prāṇa was the divinity whom he worshipped as Brahman. Superficially, it may appear that the names are the names of the Moon, and not of the prāṇa; but when Gārgya identifies the Moon with prāṇa, the names of the moon naturally become the names of the prāṇa also. So, when prāṇa becomes devoid of the capacity to experience, the senses which are overcome by prāṇa become equally devoid of that capacity. Nor can there be any possibility of any other divinity except prāṇa in the body; for as has been already seen in prāṇa alone as the only one god, like the nave

of a wheel in which the spokes are fixed, are included all other divinities. Nor can any limb of the body or any sense-organ be ever conceived to possess by itself the capacity to recollect, recognize or desire. Likewise, even on the view of momentary consciousness, can there be any memory or recognition. The perception of one cannot be the cause of recollection of another.

The pūrvapakṣa appears in a new form again. Let the gross body itself which is the collection of the four elements of earth, water, fire, and air, be said to be the Ātman. For, it is with reference to that body that there arises the awareness that, 'I am fair,' 'I am strong', etc. This also is not correct. For, in the first place, there is no distinction between the collection before sleep and the collection during sleep, and so there was no necessity of waking up the man by moving him by the hand. On the contrary, on the hypothesis of a bhoktā other than the body, the difference between being aware and not being aware of his being called by the name becomes understandable. Then, in the second place, it becomes easy to understand how the senses become awake, how there come about various actions and their various fruits as giving us pleasures and pains, and to know the causal connection between the Ātman and all other things. Then, in the third place, it can be easily understood as to how, just as a house, which is the collection of several things, such as pillars, walls, wood, stones, etc., is useful for some one other than the house, even so, prāṇa and senses, etc., which are associated with the body and reside in the body, are useful for some one else who is the seer, the hearer and the thinker of them all.

One may yet persist to say that prāṇa can be said to be the bhoktā, inasmuch as he was called out by several names, and thereby already presumed to be endowed with consciousness. Besides, Prāṇa is said to be a divinity. Therefore, to be possessed with consciousness is quite consistent with its being capable of having experience. Why should it then be said that prāṇa is useful only as an instrument to some one other than prāṇa? When one thing is quite similar to another, how can it be an instrument of the other. The light of one lamp cannot be an instrument of exhibiting the light of another lamp. The reply is that nothing is necessary to refute this, as there is no problem at all to be solved. Here, there is no discussion regarding the relation of prāṇa with the 'Sopādhika Ātman'. On the contrary,

what Ajātaśatru wished Gārgya to understand is the nature of the Nirupādhika Ātman. The various kinds of Brahma which were pointed out by Gārgya were nothing but each of them. 'Sopādhika Brahma', that is, one on which due to avidyā were superimposed nāma, rūpa, actions, and fruits. Though all this constitutes saṁsāra; none of them is real. And so, the chief and the only aim of this Upaniṣad is to undo the show of the superimposed illusions by means of the acquisition of the Ātma-vidyā. No doubt, there are, in certain passages of this Upaniṣad, descriptions of both the Sopādhika (Mūrta) and Nirupādhika (Amūrta) Brahman; but the dualistic or the pluralistic aspects of it are only imaginary and therefore unreal. What is ultimately pointed out by the negative method of 'not this, not this', (neti, neti), and by the positive statements such as, 'What is immortal (amṛta) is this much only', it is the Nirguṇa Brahman, which, unlike the Brahman in the Sun, etc., is immanent in the human body, and which Ajātaśatru wished Gārgya to understand. 15

49. *Vijñānamaya means pure Self-consciousness*

Thus after having stated that the Ātman is different from both the body and prāṇa, Ajātaśatru asked Gārgya as to where the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa was dwelling before being awakened and from where he had come back again. Regarding the meaning of the word 'Vijñāna' some say that it means the jīva who is a modification of Parabrahma, because the termination 'maya' has the sense of modification. But inasmuch as the realization of the Ātman takes place in the antaḥkaraṇa or buddhi, and as the Ātman is the witness of it, He is said to be endowed with Vijñāna or buddhi, though he is absolutely different from it. It is on account of avidyā that the pure Ātman which transcends the vijñāna is said to be almost of the same nature as of vijñāna, and so, the termination 'maya' in vijñāna-maya has the sense of being 'almost the same'. Besides, nowhere in the Śruti or Smṛti it is stated that jīva is the modification of 'vijñāna, nor can it be a portion of Brahman, since the Brahman does not consist of parts. On the contrary, it is stated that Brahman entered into its products in the form of jīva, and so, it is the Brahman who dwells or sleeps in the city of the body, and who is therefore known as 'Puruṣa'. In another passage of this Upaniṣad (4.4.5),

the Ātman is first said to be Vijñānamaya, and then immediately after, we are told, that it is 'manomaya', meaning thereby that on account of avidyā, it has become 'almost the same' as buddhi or mind. All this comes to mean that Ajātaśatru wanted to show that inasmuch as during sleep there was neither any kind of activity, nor any kind of fruit such as pleasure or pain attached to it, the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa, that is the Ātman as conditioned by the upādhis of mana and buddhi of avidyā, was sleeping in his own uncontaminated condition of pure Self-consciousness. Now, Gārgya being unable to answer the two questions, Ajātaśatru of his own accord wished to impart him the real knowledge of the Ātman in the next four Kaṇḍikās. 16

This Puruṣa is known as Vijñānamaya on account of the various specific knowledge of the senses of speech, etc., which arises in the buddhi due to the upādhis of avidyā, and it was he who was sleeping along with the senses in the ākāśa of the heart, what is meant by this is that the ākāśa of the heart was the Paramātmā and not the elemental ākāśa which is known to every body. 'He then becomes one with the Real', as the Chāndogyaopaniṣad says (6.8.1.). That is the natural state of the Ātman which is bereft of any connection with the body or the senses. He is then known as 'sleeping', that is, as possessing the quality of having realized his own real nature. 17

50. *The Ātman is different from the dreaming and wakeful consciousness*

A doubt is cast on this view, and it is pointed out that during that condition of sleep also when there occurs a dream, the objects seen and the emotions that arise on account of them are exactly of the same nature as they are in the wakeful state of man. Then, there is no connection of the Ātman with the body and the senses, and yet he is not free from the desires and emotions of a man in saṁsāra. The reply is that it is because the objects in the dream, in spite of their resemblance with the objects in the waking life, are, unreal. The dreamer comes to know that he is neither a king nor a Brahmin after he wakes up. Hence, he is not at all contaminated by whatever happens in the dream. It would be futile to argue that objects in a dream are as real during the period of the dream, as objects in the

waking condition are. For, the objects in the dream vanish as soon as one wakes up; they were seen within the body and not outside of it. The dreamer travels in the regions created by him. When, as a matter of fact, the objects of the phenomenal world, and the consequent experience of oneself, as being happy, miserable, etc., are nothing but superimpositions on the pure Ātman, how much more will this be true in the case of dreams which are nothing but the reflections of the waking life and which occur within the body and during the condition of sleep? In short, the Ātman as the Seer of sight is altogether different from both the dreaming and the wakeful consciousness and on that account is ever uncontaminated and pure. 18

As the experiences in the dream, such as wandering anywhere with pleasure, are connected with the desires of man in his wakeful life, there arises the doubt whether, in spite of the purity of the Ātman, the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa is or is not by nature impure only. But Śruti removes this doubt by saying that when he sleeps in the Paramātmān or the ākāśa in the heart, from which go forth throughout the body seventy-two thousand nāḍis (veins) known as 'hitā' (i.e., beneficial for maintaining the health of the body), he becomes incapable of knowing anything by means of his mind, buddhi, and senses. During the waking life, it is by means of these nāḍis that the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa extends his contact with the sense-organs which are mainly interested in the objects of the external world. But while doing so, he first envelops the buddhi by the power which he owes to the Caitanya or the Pure Conscious force of the Ātman. As opposed to this, when he sleeps, this power becomes more and more contracted along with the contraction of the power of buddhi and the senses. Then naturally, his connection with the external world is broken, and he does not apprehend anything. In short, though the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa is essentially the same as the Paramātmān, in the wakeful condition of the man, he becomes reflected like the image of the moon in the bodily actions, or appears as the doer of them just as the red-hot iron ball also burns like fire on account of the immanence of fire in it. During sleep, on the other hand, being bereft of all the connections with body, mind, buddhi, and the senses, 'he goes beyond all the grief of the saṃsāra as a whole, and resides in the condition of absolute bliss (Br. 4.3.22).

51. *The world, an emanation from the Ātman*

As regards the two questions raised in Kaṇḍikā sixteenth regarding the place where the Vijñānamaya was dwelling and from where he returned after the man was awakened from his sleep, we have to remember that the only motive of asking these questions is to have the clear knowledge of the distinction between Vidyā and avidyā. As we have already seen, 'one should do the upāsana of the Ātman', 'he knew the Ātman only', etc. (Br. 1.4.7.10) are statements regarding the subject-matter of Vidyā. Actions and their fruits, that is, whatever consists of nāma, rūpa, and Karma constitutes the province of avidyā. But, by now, this also must have been clear that the location of the Vijñānamaya Ātman lies in the Paramātman only; neither is he different from the Ātman nor has he come from a different source. In fact, there is nothing within or beyond the Paramātman. That the Prāṇas also emanate from Him is shown by the next Śruti passage. 19

Just as the spider produces out of himself a thread and climbs up by means of it, or just as innumerable sparks emerge and rise up from the fire, even so, from this Ātman who exists prior to the awakening of the Vijñānamaya, emerge all the prāṇas such as speech and others, all the worlds such as Bhūḥ, Bhuvaḥ, etc., all the fruits of actions, and all the beings from Brahmadeva to a pillar. In him, they merge again like bubbles in water. This whole movable and immovable world, exists as non-different from him. All this happens without the aid of any instrument, in as natural a manner as sparks arise from fire. This is known as the Upaniṣad of that Ātman or Brahman, because it is this knowledge which will enable one to attain the nature of the Brahman; and that is why the Upaniṣad is defined as 'Truth of the truth' (Satyasya satyam).

A question arises in this connection as to whom does the Upaniṣad refer. If it refers to the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa who was roused from sleep, then definitely it refers to the transmigratory soul (Saṁsārī) who is called as Brahman by courtesy; but if it refers to some one other than the saṁsārī Ātman (jīva) then it may be called as Brahman. But which of these two alternatives should be accepted as true should be decided by what the Śruti says, namely, 'in the beginning there was Brahman alone'. If we

hold that the *saṁsārī* jīva and the *a-saṁsārī* Brahman are different from each other, statements such as 'one should worship the Ātman as Ātman alone', 'he knew the Ātman as Brahman', which tell us about the non-duality of the Brahman, will be of no use. But if we hold that the jīva is non-different from Brahman, for whom then is the advice of the Śruti meant? When such is the question, it will be necessary for us to think about this a little more deeply.

52. *The Sāṁsārī jīva and the non-saṁsārī Brahman*

To state the Pūrva-pakṣa first. Inasmuch as Ajātaśatru took upon himself the task of making known the Brahma-vidyā to Gārgya, and awoke a sleeping man by moving him by his hand, it is sufficient to show how the same person is known as the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa on account of his capacity to have the sensuous knowledge, how it is that he who dreams and goes into dreamless sound sleep, and how by the illustrations of the spider which spins out a thread from his own body and goes up by means of it and the emanation of the sparks from fire it must be clear that the whole world has come out of the Ātman who was resting in sleep. As the topic of the Vijñānamaya is under discussion, no other Puruṣa is meant in order to show that he is the cause of the world. Like this, in the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad also, where the topic of the Vijñānamaya is under discussion, Bālāki is advised to know that very Being who is the source of all, the Puruṣa in the Sun, etc. (4.19). Vijñānamaya alone is then fit to be known. The same is the conclusion of what comes later on in this very Upaniṣad, namely, 'it is for the sake of the joy of the Ātman that everything else is deemed to be dear' (2.4.5). Throughout the Vedānta, the 'I' as the inner Being is said to be the fit object for being known (Br. 1.4.10: 4.4.12;). For instance, says the Upaniṣad, do not desire to know the speech; know the Being who speaks' (Kau. 3.8). The possible argument of a believer in God, namely, that though the Vijñānamaya of the waking life is *saṁsārī*, it is possible that he may become *non-saṁsārī*, the moment he goes into sleep, is pointless. For, it is impossible that a thing would change along with a change in its condition, excepting in the opinion of a nihilist. A bull which is standing or running does not change into a horse during sleep.

The properties of a substance do not change, even though the time and place may change. Otherwise, all talk about the validity of perceptual knowledge will have no meaning. Even the Sāṃkhyas and the Mīmāṃsaka logicians say with authority that a disembodied God who is already liberated cannot create the world, but that the jiva himself is the cause of the world, on account of unseen results of his past actions.

53. *Ultimately, the jiva is non-different from the Brahman*

As against this, the believer in God quotes a number of passages from Śruti and Smṛti and says that the non-saṃsāri Paramātman is alone the cause of this exceedingly wonderful world. 'He is omniscient' (Mu. 1.1.9); He goes beyond hunger and thirst (Br.3.5.1.): 'He does not get himself attached to anything (3.9.6.): 'At the command of this immutable Brahman live the Sun and the Moon' (3.8.9); 'He is the great, Ātman without being born'; 'He is the supporting bund of everything and the Lord of all', (4.4.22); 'Sinless and without old age and death' (Chā. 8.7.1); 'That very Truth (*Sat*) produced light' (Chā.6.2.3); 'The Ātman was alone in the beginning' (Ai.1.1.1); 'He is not affected by the misery of the world; for, he is beyond it' (Ka.2.2.11); 'I am the origin; from Me is produced everything else' (B.G. 10.8). Even the word 'ākāśa' used with reference to the heart is used in the sense of Paramātman, where the Vijñānamaya goes to sleep and becomes united with him. The suggestion that the 'I' in the sentence 'I am Brahman' refers to the jiva and that therefore the jiva should not feel that he is the same as Brahman, but must remain content by worshipping Him by salutations and offering of material like food, flowers etc., though desirable from the theistic point of view, is not at all correct from the metaphysical and the experiential points of view. Neither the statement, 'I am the Brahman', is an 'arthavāda' sentence intended for the glorification of the worshipper or the worshipped. It is a statement of fact, a statement of the spiritual experience. And this is quite consistent, with the various statements which declare 'It is the Brahman which has entered into the body, and is then known as jiva' (Br.2.5.18); 'In order to see the pure form of himself, he entered into everything having assumed its form' (2.5.19); 'He broke open the skull and

entered' (Ait. Up.1.3.12); 'Being hidden in all the beings, the Ātman does not become manifest' (Ka.1.3.12). 'Besides, in all the Śruti passages, as the word Ātman is used for Brahman, and as it indicates the direct perception of the inner Self of all the beings, it is clear that the saṁsārī jīva is not different from Brahman, and that there is only one, non-dual Brahman or Ātman.

54. *Flawless is the Vedāntic position*

One may point out that this position is defective in this way. If, the Paramātmā is the inner Self of all beings, he must have been experiencing all the sufferings of them all, on account of his having come in contact with their bodies; and so, he too like them would become a saṁsārī, and so all the Śrutis and the Smṛtis which declare that the Paramātmā is different from being saṁsārī would be useless. No doubt, some might try to overcome this defect by saying that Brahman does not enter in its own nature, but that when it enters, it assumes the nature of the Vijñānātmā who is both different and non-different from the Paramātmā. To the extent, therefore, to which the Paramātmā becomes different from his own original nature, he becomes a saṁsārī; but when the two are non-different from each other, the Paramātmā becomes fit to be known by the Vijñānātmā as 'I am the Brahman'. If, in short, the Brahman as it enters, is considered as both different and non-different from the Vijñānātmā, there would be no contradiction in the Śrutis and the Smṛtis.

It will be easy to refute the above-mentioned defect, if it is split into three parts. This means that the view, that the Vijñānātmā is a modification of the Paramātmā, can be stated and refuted in three ways. If we first start with the statement that the earth is a collection of particles, we shall have to accept that a jar is a modification of a portion of the earth. Similarly, we can understand that the Vijñānamaya is also a modification of a portion of the Paramātmā who is, like the earth, a collection of several elements and their products. What we call as Caitanya is a portion of that Paramātmā; and it is of this portion that the jīva (Vijñānātmā) is a modification. This is one aspect of the defect. The second aspect consists in thinking that a portion of the Paramātmā becomes itself a modified jīva, just as a piece

of land becomes barren, or just as the fingers of a man end in nails, or hair grow on a part of his body. The third aspect of the same defect can be illustrated by pointing out the modification of milk into curds, or gold into ornaments.

If, according to the first aspect of the defect, it is believed that a certain part of the homogeneous whole known as Paramātmā, becomes the jīva, then to say that both are identical in nature would not be the whole of the truth. The part will be similar but not identical with the whole. On the view that the Paramātmā is immanent in all its parts which are inseparably and organically connected with each other, and that the jīva also is such a part, then the misery of the jīva will make the Paramātmā also miserable. This view also is inadequate because it goes against experience. The third view also is equally unsatisfactory, since it is impossible to conceive that the partless and unmodifiable Paramātmā is the modified effect of anything else, just as curds is of milk. Thus all these three views go directly against reason as well as against Śruti and Smṛti, according to which 'Brahman is partless and actionless (S'ṛve. 6.19): 'This Puruṣa is without body or birth, and is yet both immanent and transcendent' (Mu. 2.1.1); 'Like ākāśa, he is eternal, all-pervading and immortal (Bṛ. 4.4.25); 'Invisible, and incapable of being born and without death' (B.G. 2.20, 25). Besides, to suppose that Vijñānātmā is a part of the immovable Paramātmā is to make it impossible for him to move to any other world, and to reap the fruits of his actions. And just as with the movement of the threads, the cloth also would move, even so the jīva being saṁsāri, Paramātmā also would be so.

To believe again that the Vijñānātmā who, like the sparks from the fire, goes away from the Paramātmā and becomes engrossed in saṁsāra, is to believe at the same time that the Paramātmā also becomes cut at the point from where the Vijñānātmā springs up. To believe in this manner is to contradict the Śruti which tells us that the Paramātmā is neither gross nor subtle. And, as there is no place which is not pervaded by the Paramātmā, to believe that a portion of his, known as Vijñānātmā, engages himself in saṁsāra is to believe that the other portions also of the Paramātmā are affected by the miseries of the saṁsāri jīva.

Why then has Śruti which is considered as being more valid

than logical reasoning given the illustrations of 'fire and its sparks', or of 'earth and jar', etc., unless it meant to show that the Paramātman consists of parts just as the fire consists of sparks? But this is to misunderstand the function of the Śruti passages. What the Śruti does is simply to make one understand the nature of an unknown thing; it does not wish to show that a thing can change its original nature. For this purpose, it has to resort to illustrations picked up from ordinary life. What is not known by one means of knowledge, such as inferences, for instance, Śruti makes it known to us by direct statements. The motive is not to show the contradictions only, but to eke out the deficiencies of other means of knowledge and its validity. Even if one were to cite hundreds of similes, it would never be possible for one to show that fire is cold or that the Sun does not scorch. Illustrations must be relevant to the meaning which is intended to be shown. From this point of view, the illustration of the sparks of fire, and the statement that the jīva is but a 'portion' (amśa) of the Brahman are intended to show that just as the sparks are non-different from the fire the jīva also is non-different from the Brahman. The Vijñānamaya therefore is the same as the Paramātman and not different from it. This will also be evident from what has been told in this very Upaniṣad, as in all others, in the beginning as well as in the end (upakrama and upasamhāra) of the topic of the creation of the world. In the beginning, 'all this was nothing but Ātman' (Br. 2.4.6); after this comes the narration of the creation, the existence, and dissolution of the world; and finally, in the end, comes the statement, 'This Ātman which has no inside or outside is the Brahman' (Br. 2.4.19). This clearly shows that the statements regarding the origin, the existence, and the dissolution of the world are intended by the Śruti not to show that the world is different from the Brahman, but to show that it is non-different from it. No special advantage can be said to be there by informing us that the world is different from the Brahman.

55. *The pārabale of the deserted prince*

A parable is told in this connection by Draviḍācārya to impress upon us that Śruti statements like, 'Thou art That', 'I am the Brahman', etc., have got only one meaning, namely, that

Brahman is the only reality, and that statements about the creation etc., of the world are only subservient to it. A certain prince, who was deserted by his parents as soon as he was born, was reared up in a family of hunters. Naturally, not knowing that he was a prince, he was accustomed to do actions like killing the animals. But when he came to know from a kind-hearted man that he was a prince and not the son of a hunter, he left off doing the duties of the hunter, and after meeting the parents began to live like a prince. Even so, the Vijñānātmā, after having been separated from the Paramātmā, began to think that he was nothing but a collection of body, senses, etc., and so engaged himself in all the affairs of the world and thought himself to be happy, miserable, weak or strong, and so on. But when he is instructed by the Spiritual Teacher in the lore of the Brahman by some such sentences, 'Thou art Brahman', he comes to know that he is nothing but Brahman. In short, the various illustrations like the sparks of the fire, etc. are meant for emphasising the fact that the jīva is nothing but the Brahman, just as the sparks are nothing but fire. That there is no duality or plurality, but that there is only one, homogeneous Brahman inside or outside is illustrated again by a piece of salt which has only one taste inside or outside (Br. 4.4.19-20).

Notwithstanding this, it might be pointed out that in the actual, practical life both the wise and the unwise refer to themselves as the doers and the enjoyers of the fruits of their actions, and that this therefore is an indication of the fact that the jīva is a part of the Paramātmā. But this is not correct. For in the case of the wise what they say is only metaphorical and not real. To them Brahman who is not doing anything is the only real doer; and what they say about themselves as 'Kartā and bhoktā' (doer and enjoyer) is simply for the purpose of social inter-communication. It has only a nominal and figurative significance, just as the blackness or redness of ākāśa has, even though it is without any colour, or just as the crystal which is pure and white is said to be red on account of the proximity of a red flower. In short, the chief aim of all the Upaniṣads is to remove the false and the imaginary ideas like the categories of parts and whole, modifications and the modified substance, as applied to the relation between the jīva and the Brahman. Their aim is to point out that 'he who realizes the Brahman goes

beyond all misery' (Ka.2.2.11). A number of Śruti and Smṛti passages are there which show that, like the redness of a white crystal on account of the vicinity of a red substance, the Brahman also appears as 'having motion or as contemplating' (Br.4.3.7); but 'it neither increases nor decreases on account of karma even though it is sinful' (4.4.23); and that it stands equipoised in all the beings, whether they are dogs or the eaters of dogs (B.G.5.18; 13.27).

56. *Valid is Karma-kāṇḍa for the ignorant, and valid the Jñāna-kāṇḍa for the wise*

Whence then arise the distinctions of Vijñānātmā, etc., in the unity and oneness of the Paramātmā, as proclaimed by all the Upaniṣads? If the former is unreal and the latter alone is real, then neither the Karma-kāṇḍa nor the Jñāna-kāṇḍa will ever be possible. For, whereas the former requires that there must be the plurality of doers, enjoyers, actions, instruments and fruits, the latter being opposed to this, believes that there is no saṁsāri jīva at all. For whom then is the advice regarding the doing of actions or of realizing the Brahman meant? In other words, in the absence of the jīva and in the existence of one unitary Brahman, the advice regarding karma or jñāna would simply become impossible. But, on the other hand, if distinctions and differences are allowed, the protagonists of both karma and jñāna would say that the advice is useful and necessary for the purposes of attaining heaven or mokṣa (liberation).

And yet, in spite of the option as to which way one should go, it will be pointed out that one of the two ways alone will have the greater validity. Judged from this point of view, it might appear that karma-kāṇḍa has greater validity than what the jñāna-kāṇḍa has. For, it means what it states. The obtainment of various fruits and of worlds like heaven is possible only on the presumption of various distinctions in the created world. The means of validity necessarily shows the knowledge that is valid, just as the light of a lamp shows the object which comes into light. But this is not true in the case of jñāna-kāṇḍa. The Upaniṣads which tell us about the unity and the oneness of Brahman which is already the very state of being liberated will have no other person who might seek liberation. Not only will

this be self-defeating, but also fault-finding with reference to karma-kāṇḍa, as well as in direct opposition of the generally acknowledged means of valid knowledge, such as perception and others.

But this is not correct. For, the validity or the invalidity of the means of knowledge is determined by the proof whether or not it produces right kind of knowledge or not. If, the validity of the means of knowledge were to be accepted without the production of knowledge, the pillars and walls also would have to be considered as means of valid knowledge. How can the Upaniṣads then be said to be invalid if they have the capacity to produce the knowledge of the unity of Brahman? Can anyone say that they do not do so, just as the sentence, 'fire is cold,' does not tell us anything about the real nature of fire? But, if the fire does its own function, namely, of manifesting an object by the light it emits, even so the censure of the Upaniṣads will have no meaning if they are seen to be valid in their own way? And what will the opponent gain by calling his own censure and the instruction of the Upaniṣads respectively valid or invalid, as he likes? Is not the removal of grief, infatuation, etc., the direct and concrete fruit of the Upaniṣadic instruction? The study of the Upaniṣads brings with it automatically knowledge of the oneness of Brahman. Constant thinking about it makes it strong and deep-rooted; and then, gradually, there comes about the cessation of grief and infatuation. Hence, there ought to be no doubt regarding the validity of the knowledge of the Upaniṣads.

Neither do they tell us one thing at a time and just the opposite of it at the same or another time, so that one can accuse them as being contradictory. That Brahman is one and non-dual is their only constant teaching, and so it is futile to suggest that their advice is self-defeating. The Upaniṣadic passages have got only one meaning, and are therefore incapable of being self-contradictory. Nor are they concerned with proving that the validity of Karma-kāṇḍa is not genuine. On the contrary, they allow full scope for the self-validity of the assertions of the Karma-kāṇḍa; but that is in the field of actions only. Sentences like, 'One who wishes to get into heaven should perform the Darśa and Pūrṇamāsa sacrifices', etc., have got the fullest possible meaning for those who are interested in ascending

to heaven after death. But with all this, it loses its significance for those very persons if they become convinced of the unitary knowledge of Brahman. In short, the Upaniṣadic passages are not intended for proving that passages from Karma-kāṇḍa carry no meaning whatsoever; they are only useful in showing that notwithstanding the meaningful assertions of the Karma-kāṇḍa, it will be of no avail in enabling us to know the oneness of Brahman.

The Karma-kāṇḍa is valid not only with reference to the meaning of the assertions in it, but also with reference to its instruction regarding the right sort of actions, the manner in which they ought to be done in order to obtain the desired fruits, and to avoid the undesired ones. Judged from the viewpoint of Brahma-jñāna, however, one might say that the Agnihotra (the daily routine of putting oblations in fire), for instance, has no purpose to serve; or that it is there on account of some desires which one wishes to fulfil; or that, like an illusion, it is there due to the ignorance of what is real and abiding. But, even then, it can never be said that the statements regarding the Agnihotra do not mean anything, or that they mislead a person by telling him what is altogether false, so that he would never attain his objects of desire including the heaven. It is not that Karma-kāṇḍa will be serviceable only to those who are less intelligent; even to the most intelligent it will be so, provided they are keen after getting their desires fulfilled. So long as one means by 'Vidyā' all that concerns with divinities and the materials which can be offered to them for winning their favour, even the most learned would be considered as fit for the study and practice of Karma-kāṇḍa. But if by vidyā, we are to understand the knowledge of Brahman as the only Reality, then whosoever wishes to have it shall have necessarily to give up the Karma-kāṇḍa as being of no use to him. Till then, it has to be accepted that the karma-kāṇḍa is useful to the ignorant who are immersed in the desires and the pleasures of the worldly life.

This need not, however, mean that the scriptures, whether relating to karma or jñāna, will compel a man to do or not do one way or the other. It cannot perforce divert the mind of a man from the external sensuous objects by which he becomes attracted, or be able to persuade him to be attached to

them, if he has a feeling of disgust for them. Like a lamp which is useful to show the objects which were not seen in darkness, what the scriptures do is either to give instruction as to what means are to be used for obtaining or avoiding the desired or undesirable objects, or to instruct the means of becoming one with the Brahman. The scriptures leave the man free to act as he wants and likes, and remain indifferent to what is being chosen and done in order to have it. To his three sons who practised the great penance of celibacy, Prajāpati gave quite the same advice by pronouncing the letter 'da'. But gods understood that it meant the practice of 'self-control' (dama); men understood it as meaning 'charity' (dāna); and the demons understood it as meaning 'compassion to beings' (dayā).

57. *Upaniṣadic instruction is necessary before the realization of the Brahman*

Therefore just as each of the senses, ear, eye, etc., is competent to produce knowledge which is peculiar to it, even so, the scripture regarding karma and the one regarding jñāna is competent in its own sphere namely of works, or of the realization of the Brahman. But there are some who call themselves learned and say that the Vedāntic statements teach us something which is contradictory to all the three valid means of knowledge, namely, perception, inference, and śabda (authority). And the evidence given by them is that the knowledge of Brahman is neither due to perception, nor in keeping with the inference that those who have the perceptual knowledge are in fact the many jīvas (and not the one Brahman), nor again consistent with the fact that there are different kinds of persons who follow the Vedic injunctions according to what they desire to possess, namely, land, progeny, or heaven. Thus they conclude that the knowledge of the oneness of Brahman cannot be had inasmuch as all instruction about it goes contrary to perception, inference and to what is stated in the Karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas.

Such accursed among the Brahmins who being endowed with poor understanding are given to reason erroneously, should only be pitied. One can ask them, however, if the perceptual differences due to the five senses are interfered by the oneness of the ākāśa. If not, why do they complain that the oneness of

the knowledge of Brahman contradicts the sensuous perceptions? And who are they who live in different bodies and are therefore responsible as agents for different perceptions and inferences? Then the so-called experts in logic might perhaps reply that they are the logicians themselves. In that case, they should be told that they are either their bodies or their senses or mind, but that these being inconscient are incapable of making any inference, and that the Ātman too is incapable on account of its incapacity to change in any manner. Being cornered in this way, they might reply that inference also being an act, which becomes effective on account of several factors, they are the souls who perform that act. But in trying to reply what that soul or Ātman is, they would again fall back upon the old reply that it is either their body, senses or mind. They do not understand that the differences in the Ātman are due to these various upādhis of body, senses and mind, or, to put it differently, due to the various kinds of nāma and rūpa which are superimposed upon it, just as the upādhis of jars, pots, etc., make the one ākāśa appear as consisting of many parts. The names and forms are amenable to being produced and dissolved. But the Brahman is not. It being altogether different from them can never become the subject-matter of inferential knowledge. How can it then contradict inference at all?

To admit that all the practical life is possible on account of the distinctions of upādhis, is to refute also the charge that the knowledge of the unity of Brahman goes against the instruction of the Scriptures. It is argued that if Brahman alone is real, and if nothing else is real then for whom is the instruction meant, and who at all should get the fruit of that instruction. But the reply also would come in the same strain. Who then will there be to ask this question since asking of the question is also a kind of action and is dependent on several factors, such as the speaker, the speech, etc.? We also grant that in the upādhi-less Brahman there is neither any scope for any instructor, nor for his instruction; nor can there be any person who would accept that instruction and get the fruit of it. With the realization of Brahman, what need will be there for the Upaniṣadic instruction? But to say that it would be equally useless before the realization of Brahman is absurd. For, that will defeat the very purpose of instruction which, as all realizers of the Ātman

have insisted upon, is absolutely necessary for the realization of the Brahman. 'When there is none else except the realizer of Brahman to know it' (Ka. 1.2.21), 'when gods could not solve this great mystery' (Ka. 1.1.21); when it is said that no logical reasoning would enable one to realize the Ātman' (Ka. 1.2.9), how can these kings of flatterers and indecent logicians know what is obtained by the grace of great spiritual teachers? 20

(Here ends the second Brāhmaṇa of the second Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SECOND: BRĀHMAṆA SECOND

With the parable of Ajātaśatru and Gārgya started the topic of Brahma-vidyā, and it was told that in the Brahman alone the world has its origin, and in the Brahman alone it is dissolved; that the world consists of the five elements, and that these elements, in their turn, consist of names and forms, which appear to have reality of their own, but that Brahman alone is the Reality behind all of them. Why is it, however, it might be asked, that these perishable five elements are called as reals at all? A reply to this constitutes the subject-matter of this Brāhmaṇa known as 'Murtāmūrta' (gross and subtle) Brāhmaṇa. The body as the visible effect and the senses (known as Prāṇas) as the invisible instruments of knowledge are all real from the practical point of view. But to know the underlying reality of this phenomenal appearance is the purpose of this and the next Brāhmaṇas. When the subject-matter of this adhyāya as well as of the next two adhyāyas is the Brahma-vidyā, to determine the nature and the number of prāṇas and to ascertain the reality behind them is like the traveller's incidental observation of a well or a garden on his way.

58. *Traveller's Prāṇa compared to a child and the man's head as an inverted pot*

The Brahmaṇa starts with the description of the Prāṇa as a child, who, as the preceding Brāhmaṇa has shown us, was called out by names, 'Great', 'Soma', 'King', 'one who wore a white

garment'. It is the Prāṇa who has entered into the body in five different ways (prāṇa, apāna, etc.) and in whom are fixed the five senses (prāṇas) of ear, eye, speech, etc. The peculiar feature of this chief Prāṇa is that like the other prāṇas (senses), he is not an adept in doing a particular function on account of his being a child, but that like a well-bred horse, he has got the strength of uprooting at once all the iron-rods of senses to which his legs and hands are tied. This very physical body is the receptacle in which the child resides; that is, the shelter of the Prāṇa, and it is in this body and not in the Prāṇa alone that the senses get the capacity to know. All this was clearly shown by Ajātaśatru by pointing out that the Vijñānamaya is not awakened when the senses are resting in sleep, but that he becomes immediately conscious the moment the senses begin to work in the body.

The head also is said to be the receptacle of the Prāṇa, since in seven different regions of the head are situated the seven prāṇas or the senses, namely, the two eyes, the two ears, the two nostrils, and the tongue. It is Prāṇa which, on account of the strength it received from food, stands erect in the body like a pillar to which a calf is tied by a rope in the form of food. One who knows the Prāṇa as having this form, will not be affected by whatever harm the above-mentioned seven senses (prāṇas) might intend to do, by diverting his mind away from the Ātman. The head can also be construed as a sacrificial pot known as 'Camasa' in which is kept the 'soma' juice. It has its bottom upside and its hole (mouth) downwards: The seven senses or the prāṇas will then be construed as seven great sages, such as Gotama, Bhāradwāja, Vasiṣṭha, etc. 2-4

(Here ends the second Brāhmaṇa of the second Adhyaya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SECOND: BRĀHMAṆA THIRD

There are persons who hold that the Brahman is real in its differentiated form alone. But it will be seen that the first two kaṇḍikās only deal with the nature of this differentiated Brahman, while the remaining portion of the Brāhmaṇa deals with

the undifferentiated kind of Brahman. The former is perishable, as it is limited and is amenable to change and motion; the latter is imperishable as it is neither amenable to change and motion, nor limited by anything else. Besides, it has the unique character of being directly realized. So all that can be said about it by the so-called valid means of perception, inference, etc., is only an indirect statement about it. 1

59. The manifest and the unmanifest are the two aspects of the Brahman

What is known as the Mūrta or the differentiated Brahman consists of what remains after eliminating the two great elements of Vāyu and the Antarikṣa (wind and ākāśa) from the five elements. In other words, it consists of the three elements of Earth, Water, and Fire. Of this differentiated, perishable, perceptible and limited existence, there are three visible forms, namely, the dark, the white, and the brown; and these go to form the very essences of the three elements, since they have been produced in them by the power of the Sun. Hence, the disc of the Sun, which is manifest (mūrta) on account of his quality of burning, is considered as the real essence of this threefold mortal existence. As to how this celestial (adhidaivika) aspect in the form of the Sun has come to be thought of as the essence, we shall see presently.

As to what constitutes the imperishable, 'Amūrta' (unmanifest) Brahman, they are the remaining two elements, namely, Vāyu and Antarikṣa. Being unlimited and all-pervading it does not come in contradiction with anything else. Nor does it become perceptible like the objects of the manifest Brahman; and so, it has to be explained in an indirect manner. Of this immortal, unmanifest Brahman also, the essence exists in the Sun; but it is not in the visible disc but in the form of the causal Puruṣa, known as the Hiranyagarbha or the Prāṇa, who resides in that disc. It was for the production of the very subtle body of the Hiranyagarbha that there came forth the two unmanifest elements of Vāyu and Ākāśa out of the unmodifiable (avyākṛta) Brahman. Hence, there being the similarity of qualities (sādharmya) between what is known as the Puruṣa in the disc of the Sun and these two elements, the Puruṣa is said to be the very

essence of the unmanifest, immortal Brahman. 2-6

60. *Examination of different views about the Puruṣa*

Let us now mention some of the forms which this Puruṣa known as the Hiraṇyagarbha assumes as he likes and which are stored in the buddhi. The forms cannot be attributed to the unchangeable Ātman. Like the forms of Māyā or magic, they delude the mind. So, sometimes like a red beetle, or like a flame of fire, or a white lotus, or like the sudden appearance of lightning, the sādḥaka sees these mystical forms, whereupon his fame spreads far and wide. It must however, be remembered that the words 'neti, neti', (not this, not this) refer to the Brahman only. Otherwise, like the Buddhists of the nihilistic variety, people would be tempted to say that the momentary awareness of the Self, as qualified by various emotions, states, consciousness of mind, and intellect, is the only kind of Ātman that can be realized by man. Or, like the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas they would believe that there is nothing like the Ātman over and above the Antaḥkaraṇa as qualified by the various emotions, desires and states, and that these alone constitute the entire field of the activities of the so-called Ātman. Or, like the Sāṃkhyas they would believe that the Ātman is self-illuminating but actionless, and would think that it is the buddhi or the antaḥkaraṇa that is being controlled and guided by the Pradhāna or Prakṛti under the influence of the three guṇas.

There are others still who following Bhartṛprapañca call themselves as the adherents of the Upaniṣadic teachings, and yet make common cause with their opponents as it suits their convenience. Imagining that there are three groups of things, they consider that the best among them is the Paramātman; the least as that formed by the manifest and the unmanifest aspects of the world; and the intermediary as the Vijñānamaya himself, who, as Ajātaśatru had pointed out, consists of Vidyā, Karma, and Prajñā, and as such is considered as both the doer and the enjoyer. According to them, it is this Vijñānamaya who is helped on all hands by Vidyā, Karma, Jñāna, as well as by the material and non-material environment around him. Contradicting themselves, they say, on the one hand, in common with the logicians, that the karma of a man leans for support on his desires, etc.,

but fearing that this would amount to the position of the Sāṃkhyas, they would immediately say, on the other hand, that just as the scent of a flower, even after the flower is withered away, may continue to exist in the scent-pot or in oil, even so the karma of a man may linger in the Paramātman, even though the man might have no desire left in him. They will have no hesitation in saying this, because they would explain that though the Paramātman is nirguṇa, and is not affected by the karma and the guṇas, he assumes the role of the Vijñānamaya and becomes to that extent the doer and the enjoyer of actions and their fruits, and appears as being bound and released, though in fact, he is never a saṃsāri soul. The karma which springs up in man on account of his being made up of the elements is an accretion, so to say, on a portion of the nirguṇa Paramātman, just as a piece of barren land, in spite of its being earth, exhibits its barrenness on a portion of the earth itself. Thus, they try to please the Sāṃkhyas also by saying that the wrong notion about the Vijñānamaya that he is the doer, the enjoyer, etc., is through and through avidyā, and that it comes from the Paramātman and resides in antaḥkaraṇa which is nothing but a portion of the Paramātman.

Delighted do they seem in having a compromising attitude with the logicians and others, but they do not know that they are doing so by showing utter disregard to the canons of logic as well as to the truth of the Upaniṣads. If the Vijñānātmā is to be believed as occupying only a portion of the Paramātman, then it follows that the latter consists of parts and divisions, and is beset with the desires of enjoying the fruits of actions. On the other hand, if there is a clear-cut division between the Vijñānātmā and the Paramātman, then their coming together and becoming as one whole is unthinkable. Or, supposing that the distinction between the Paramātman and the Vijñānamaya jīva is only apparent and not real on account of the limitations of subtle body etc., just as the distinction between the one unlimited ākāśa and the smaller ākāśas which, though unreal, appear to be falsely existing on account of the upādhis (limitations) of the walls of the jar, room, etc., can we say that the jīva is a portion of the Ātman? This too is not possible; since the jīva is at rest during sleep, how can the 'vāsanās' (desires) of the jīva be said to belong to the Paramātman? As for the belief that avidyā arises

out of the Paramātman, we have to remember that, in the first place, avidyā is just the opposite of the Ātman, and that inasmuch as, in the second place, avidyā and the condition of being engrossed in saṁsāra are one and the same, it would only mean that Paramātman himself is engrossed in saṁsāra.

Similarly, it is needless to imagine that there are three groupings as conceived by Bhartṛprapañca, when the Śruti passage clearly states that the unmanifest and the manifest are the two forms of the Brahman. Neither are they (as bereft from the vāsanās) the two aspects of the Paramātman, nor do the vāsanās belong to the Vijñānamaya; for, to suppose this is to suppose that Vijñānamaya is different from the Paramātman. All this indicates that they are the imaginings of a confused mind which wishes to remain satisfied with something beyond the Vedic instruction. Therefore it is that at the end of the Kaṇḍikā, the reference to the Brahman is made as 'the Truth of the truth', and as 'neti, neti'. If there is no characteristic in the Brahman, such as, nāma, rūpa, karma, bheda (difference), jāti (kind), and guṇa, which can be expressed by means of words, the only alternative to describe it would be the negative one, namely, 'not this, not this'. When, however, in certain passages, the Brahman is described in positive terms such as, 'Vijñānaghana', Ātmā, 'Vijñānam Ānandam Brahma', then it only means that the same nirupādhika Brahman is referred to as being superimposed by the qualities. And as to why the two negative 'not this, not this' are used, when one would have been sufficient, the reply is that it is to point out the exclusion of all the objects of thought and desire from the scope of the meaning of the undifferentiated Brahman. 6

(Here ends the third Brāhmaṇa of the second Adhyāya of the
Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SECOND: BRĀHMAṆA FOURTH

So far, it has been told that the direct realization of the Ātman is the subject-matter of the Brahma-vidyā, that the Ātman alone can be the dearest of all, and that the Ātman must be contemplated upon as the Ātman only. Even so, the subject-matter of avidyā was narrated as being the triad of nāma, rūpa, and

karma, and that one who knows that he is different from the Ātman cannot have any knowledge of the Ātman. All that goes by the name of karma including the duties of the four castes and of the four āśramas, all that constitutes the saṁsāra including the ends to be achieved and the means to be adopted, is as endless as the relation between the seed and the sprout. Whether it grows upwards through prosperity on account of the doing of actions according to the scriptural instructions, or goes down through adversity and misery on account of the doing of actions which are not ordained by the scriptures, the whole of the saṁsāra is confined within the two upward and downward limits, namely, the Brahmaloṇa and the inorganic matter. The latter is attained by the knowledge of the scriptures and Karma, while the former, by the knowledge about Brahman and by actions consistent with that knowledge.

61. *Sannyāsa is only a preparation to realise Brahman*

As both these aspects of saṁsāra go to form the province of avidyā it was thought necessary to end the first adhyāya of this Upaniṣad with the anxious thought as to how indeed the avidyā could be ended, and how one would feel disgust for saṁsāra and become fit for achieving the Brahma-vidyā. It is in the second adhyāya therefore that the subject-matter of the Brahma-vidyā is introduced by Ajātaśatru with the observation, 'let me instruct you, O Gārgya, about the nature of the Brahman', and then in the course of discussion, it was pointed out that the Brahman is one, non-dual, devoid of any distinctions, devoid of actions and their fruits, as also of all the qualities of the five elements and of names and forms, including even the name 'Satya'. That is why, when all the Karma connected with wife, progeny, wealth, etc., is discarded as being the subject-matter of avidyā, the sannyāsa or the renunciation of actions is recommended as an adjunct of the Brahma-vidyā. Progeny, wealth, etc., are capable of enabling us to achieve different worlds such as that of men, of the manes, and of gods, but not at all the realization of the Ātman. Nor are these actions meant for the realizer of the Brahman, since he has no desire of his own. So, neither the karma by itself, nor the karma which is combined with the intellectual knowledge of the

scriptures, will ever be of any avail in producing the Brahmajñāna.

Notwithstanding this, there are persons who tell us that even the realizers of Brahman are found to entertain desires. It seems they have had no occasion to read or to listen to what is written in the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad. Desires with reference to progeny, wealth etc. have meaning only in the context of the behaviour of a man immersed in saṁsāra. But the passages which begin with, 'what shall we do with progeny' and end with 'To us, this Ātman is the only world which is dearest' (4.4.22), tell us about the Brahmadevyā only. Therefore not only do such persons go against the Śruti, but they tell us also what goes against reasoning. They do not understand that with the rise of the Sun of Brahmajñāna, is destroyed the whole of the avidyā including actions and their fruits. It seems they have not heard what the great sage Vyāsa has said, namely, 'it is by karma that man is bound; and it is by Vidyā that he is released'. Hence, the conclusion we can draw is that without the least support of any other means the Brahmadevyā can bear its own independent and immortal fruit, and so the renunciation of all other works and means becomes only a preparation for being fit to realize the Brahman.

62. *Women also can realize the Brahman*

That sannyāsa is helpful for the emergence of Brahmadevyā inasmuch as it affords ample opportunities for doing Śravaṇa and manana, can be proved on several grounds. That is the only means of having immortality is told in Adhyāya fourth. That Yājñavalkya entered the sannyāsa āśrama in spite of his being a doer of works, as will be told at the end of the fourth adhyāya, is also a clear proof that Karma combined with intellectual knowledge will not enable one to have liberation. According to the scriptures dealing with Karma-kāṇḍa, no woman has any right to perform works, if the husband has gone away renouncing the world. But we find that Maitreyi was being instructed into the lore of the Brahman, even though her husband, Yājñavalkya, was about to accept sannyāsa. Besides, she too had censured wealth by saying, 'what shall I do with wealth, if thereby I cannot realize the Ātman?' (2.4.3). And,

finally, as the Upaniṣad tells us (2.4.6.), if the egoism attached to the castes and the āśramas does not enable a person to leave his ignorance of the Ātman, the castes themselves will leave him, meaning thereby that all the scriptural injunctions regarding the duties of the castes, etc., have no meaning with reference to one who renounces the world for the sake of achieving Brahman-vidyā. The following parable is intended to inculcate the same truth, namely, that sannyāsa is helpful for having Brahmajñāna.

The sage, Yājñavalkya, says to his wife, 'I intend, Maitreyi, to accept the sannyāsa āśrama, and so I wish to have your consent. But before leaving, I wish to divide my wealth between you and my other wife, Kātyāyani.' Whereupon, Maitreyi asked him whether she could attain immortality, if she were to have the whole of the earth filled with wealth. 'No', replied Yājñavalkya, 'you would only be happy and prosperous in the same way in which others endowed with wealth would be. You cannot even dream of attaining immortality by doing any actions by means of wealth.' 'If this is so, then what shall I do by having wealth? Tell me, please, the means of obtaining immortality,' Maitreyi requested her husband. Being pleased with her reply, Yājñavalkya said to her, 'O you are most dear to me. Come and sit near me; I shall tell you the means of attaining immortality. Listen carefully to what I say, and meditate upon it with determination.' 1-4

63. *The Ātman alone ought to be the dearest of all*

Saying so Yājñavalkya continued: "It is not for the sake of the husband that the husband becomes dear, it is for the sake of the Self (Ātman) that he becomes dear; it is not for the sake of wife, progeny, wealth, Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, the different worlds, gods, beings, or for anything else that all these become dear to one, but that they become so for the sake of the Ātman. Therefore, what is (and ought to be) the dearest of all is the Ātman only, and not anything else. It is only by courtesy that we say that wife, progeny, etc., are dear to us. One should therefore listen to what his spiritual teacher would tell him about the Ātman, and then seeing the Ātman, should always meditate and contemplate upon it. Śravaṇa is absolutely necessary, no doubt, but thinking constantly about what is heard, direct perception

of the Ātman, and thereafter gazing at it (contemplating again and again) are all absolutely necessary for fixing the knowledge of the Ātman permanently in oneself. Otherwise there might creep in number of obstacles between Śravaṇa and contemplation upon the Ātman. Verily, O Maitreyi, to realize the Ātman thus is to have the knowledge of everything else. In fact, there is nothing else but the Ātman; otherwise the knowledge of one thing will never enable us to have the knowledge of another thing. It is out of the Ātman that everything else springs up; in him all things live, and in him are dissolved all of them. Not knowing this, if one considers that he is only a Brahmin or a Kṣatriya, or that he is different from the Ātman, then surely that very caste would leave him away.' 5, 6

64. *An unconscious reference to the self is involved in all knowledge*

Even the knowledge of the external world would not in truth be possible without reference to the Caitanya or the conscious self. One may not be able to recognize from a distance that it is the sound of a drum being beaten, or a conch-shell being blown, or of a flute being played upon, but approaching near and nearer, if he finds that a person is beating a drum or blowing a conch or playing upon a flute, he would immediately come to know the nature of the sound. It is therefore after knowing a person or a conscious Self behind the sound that there arises the real and definite knowledge of the sound as an object of the external world, and that of the means whereby the sound has been produced by that person. In the absence of the self or the Ātman, neither the means, namely, the drum, the conch, etc., nor the objects, namely, the particular sound have got any inherent power in them to produce any knowledge about them. In short, the world can neither exist nor be known without the existence of the all-pervading Ātman.' 7.9

'And just as the existence of the Ātman or the Brahman is necessary to explain the existence of the world, even so, it is possible to know that the Brahman exists prior to the origination of the world. Just as there must be fire before it manifests in several forms such as, sparks, smoke, cinders and flames, even so the world with its manifest division of names and forms

must have been before its manifestation, the one homogeneous mass of consciousness. Like this, O Maitreyi, Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda, Atharva Veda, Itihāsa (history), Purāṇas, Vidyās, Upaniṣads, Verses, Aphorisms, the explanations of Mantras and Arthavāda sentences are all the breaths of that great being, namely, the Brahman. No doubt, to call the Vedas as the breaths of Brahman does not rob them of their self-validity, or make them perishable in nature. For, they have not been made by any human intelligence or effort; nor what they teach becomes contradicted by anything else, though from the view-point of one who has realized the Brahman, they may appear as conveying to him what he knows already. 10

‘Similarly, during the time of dissolution also this world of nāma, rūpa and karma has no existence of its own apart from the one, homogeneous, consciousness of Brahman in which it is merged, just as the foam and bubbles on water have no separate existence of their own. Just as all waters of the world, whether of the wells, tanks, lakes or rivers, have no other final destination except to merge in the water of the ocean, just as all smells meet in the nose; all tastes in the tongue; all forms in the eye, all sounds and words in the ear, all imaginings in the mind, all learning of the vidyās in the heart, all actions in the two hands, all pleasures in the organ of generation, all the waste is thrown out of the anus, all the journey is undertaken by means of feet, so is all the Vedic instruction comprised in the tongue only. But it should be remembered that the dissolution takes place of not only the effects but also of the causes of those effects. Accordingly, not only the words and sounds, for instance, are dissolved, but also the sense-organ of the ear which hears them and which is of the same nature, is also dissolved, and so, there remains neither the Upādhis nor the causes of those Upādhis. In other words, what remains is the one, eternal, imperishable, infinite, homogeneous Consciousness, namely the Brahman only. In fact, what is known as the sense-organ is nothing but a re-arrangement of the same specific sense-objects in view of the necessity to have a receptacle for receiving the sense-impressions.

Naturally, when the dissolution takes place, it is of both the senses and their objects. First of all, it takes place in Prāṇa; second, in the mind; third, in the buddhi; fourth, in the Vijñāna-maya; and finally, in the one Parabrahma. 11

65. *The dissolution of all things in Brahman must be consciously worked out*

The traditional way of speaking about this dissolution is that it is a natural one; but the knowers of the *Brahma-vidyā* call it as one which must be consciously brought about and that too once for all. It resembles, O Maitreyi, the dissolution of a piece of salt in water. When once that piece is completely dissolved, none can ever take it back from water. For, it becomes then so thoroughly mixed up with the whole of water that any drop of it would taste salty only. Even so when you, who have come to possess the limitations of body, senses, etc., on account of *avidyā*, and have therefore become subject to hunger, thirst, birth and death, and have got a particular name, caste, etc., would dissolve back again into that great being who is without birth, death or fear, who is the pure, homogeneous, immeasurable, eternal source of consciousness, what would happen is that all these limitations would be destroyed one after another, and you too would be forthwith one with that great crystal-like pure, infinite Brahman. Then, just as there would be no meaning in speaking about a man in sound sleep that he is endowed with the consciousness that he is happy or miserable, or that he is aware of being the son of somebody, or as having wealth, house, etc., even so, after you become one with the Brahman, you will cease to have any mark of being a particular individual, having such and such qualities or characteristics. All the present *upādhis* by which you are bound will then be destroyed along with the cause of them, namely, the *avidyā*.' 12

Being unable to grasp the exact meaning of what her husband had narrated, Maitreyi says with a complaining tone, 'Why do you, my revered lord, bewilder me by telling me contradictory things? You once say that Brahman is the one, homogeneous mass of Consciousness and then tell me again that there remains no consciousness of anything after death'. 'No, I have not told you that one and the same being is and is not endowed with consciousness. It is you who are thinking that two contradictory characteristics belong to one and the same substance. I only told you that the consciousness that is born out of *avidyā*, namely, of that which is the complex of body, senses, mind, etc., is destroyed along with *avidyā*, by being dissolved in the

consciousness that one is nothing but the Brahman. Just as the reflection of the moon in water and the reflected light are both destroyed the moment the upādhi of water is destroyed, excepting the moon who shines in the sky, even so, what remains after the fall of the body is neither the tiny individuality of man, nor his circumscribed consciousness of the body, senses, social status, etc., but the one, homogeneous consciousness of the Brahman in whom that individuality is dissolved. The Brahman is the Ātman of all beings; and so he does not perish even though all the beings perish. Verily, what is modifiable can be spoken of as capable of being destroyed, as the Chāndogyopaniṣad says (6.14); 'but this Ātman is unmodifiable, the illumination of which is never eclipsed by anything else. So, what I have told you, O Maitreyi, is quite sufficient to enable you to realize that eternal consciousness of Brahman.' 13

When, however, there arises the wrong notion due to avidyā that one is different from the non-dual Brahman, that is, when there arises the imaginary belief in duality where there is none, the jīva thinks that he is different from the sense-organs also, and so smells something else from his own real Being, sees and hears and thinks about something else which is not his real Being. But during the realization of Brahman, there being no such difference between actions, instruments or means of actions and their effects, who should smell what and by what means? Who should see or hear or think about what, and by what means? During the condition of avidyā, the jīva can never know the Ātman due to whose ultimate power there comes about the empirical knowledge of the world. The power of the sense-organs is exhausted in being aware of the objects of the external world. Who and by what means therefore can one know the Ātman who is beyond all the means of empirical knowledge? 14

(Here ends the fourth Brāhmaṇa of the second Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SECOND : BRĀHMAṆA FIFTH

The Ātman being the dearest and the most blissful, we are told in the last Brāhmaṇa that we must know him by listening

to what the Spiritual teacher would tell us and by reading about Him in the scriptures. We are also advised to think about the Ātman and know him to be the ground, the source and the destination of all. There might arise however, the doubt as to how it is that in him are born all the beings and in him are dissolved all of them. To dispel this doubt is the object of this Brāhmaṇa.

66. *Everything is the Madhu of everything else*

Just as a bee-hive is prepared by many bees, even so this earth is the workmanship of innumerable beings. Reciprocally, all the beings are a bee-hive produced out of this earth. These are not, however, the only two effects (madhus). There are two more, namely, the physical human body made up of the earthly nature, and the resplendent immortal, conscious Puruṣa within this bodily frame. These four constitute 'madhu'. In the first place, it is the effect brought about by all the beings. And, then, secondly and reciprocally, all the beings are the 'madhu' of these four. All this means that this world with all its things owes its existence to a single cause, namely, the Brahman. All else which is modifiable and nameable is perishable. In short, this (idam) assemblage of four is the immortal Ātman and this knowledge of the Ātman is the only thing which is all-in-all. 1

Similarly, water is the 'madhu' of all the beings, and reciprocally, all the beings are the Madhu of water. The immortal, resplendent Puruṣa in water, as well as the immortal, resplendent Puruṣa in the semen of man, are the Madhu of all beings and vice versa. And it is this Puruṣa who is the immortal Ātman, the Brahman and the all. (2) Similarly, fire is the Madhu of all beings, and vice versa. Besides this immortal resplendent Puruṣa in the fire, as well as the Puruṣa of the same nature in the speech of man, are the Madhu of all beings, and vice versa. The knowledge of these four is the knowledge of the Brahman, which means the realization of everything else. 3

Similarly are the wind, the Sun, the Quarters and the Moon respectively, the Madhu of all beings, and vice versa. And the resplendent, immortal Puruṣa in each one of them, as also the Puruṣa residing in the Prāṇa, in the eye, in the ear, and in the mind, are the Madhus of all beings and vice versa. Every one

of these groups of four constitutes the Ātman, the Brahman, and the all. (4.7) Similarly are the lightning, the rain and the ākāśa the Madhu of all beings and vice versa. And the resplendent and immortal Puruṣas residing in them as well as in the lustre of the bodily skin, in the melodious voice, and in the hearts of men, are the Madhus of all beings and vice versa. And, further to know all these Puruṣas is to know the Ātman, the immortal Brahman and all. (8-10) Dharma and Satya (Truth) are also the Madhu of all beings, and vice versa. Dharma is the cause of this wonderful creation and the Controller of even the most powerful class of men, namely, the Kṣatriyas. It is also directly perceivable in the conduct of men, and as such acts as an incentive for actions. In this sense, it becomes known as Truth (satya); and then the two words 'dharma' and 'satya' stand for the theoretical and practical sides of one and the same moral excellence. Naturally, the Puruṣas who reside in them are both resplendent and immortal. To know them both in theory and in practice is to become connected with the immortal Ātman, the Brahman and all. (11-12) Helped by the dharma and satya, this human community, notwithstanding the several castes in which it is divided, lives in co-operation with all beings. So, both of them are Madhu to each other. Similarly, the immortal resplendent Puruṣa who lives in them in the form of body is the immortal Ātman, the Brahman and the all. (13) And, finally, this very Ātman who lives in all the beings is the Madhu to them all, and the beings are the Madhu to Him. It is that impersonal, unmanifest Ātman who is immanent in all other Ātmans of all other beings and gods, and who is without any differentiation or bodily form, who is the immortal Brahman and all. 14

67. *The realizer of Brahman becomes the Self of all*

About this finally described Ātman, it should be noted that he is none else but the realizer of Brahman; for, it is he who in spite of his bodily form and of his being known as 'Vijñānamaya' enters into the Parabrahma, and is therefore then known as indivisible, as having nothing external to him, as one homogeneous, perfect mass of Consciousness, as the internal Self of all, as the only fit object of worship, and as the independent Over-lord of all. No doubt, before the realization of Brahman,

he was the same Brahman; but avidyā made him feel that he was not so. Now, that he has contemptuously discarded the avidyā, he has become the realizer of Brahman, and thereby has become all.

Here ends the *Brahma-vidyā* which was being told since the beginning of this *adhyāya*. But it is interesting to know according to the realizer of the Brahman how the entire world takes its place in the Brahman. In Brahman are fixed all the beings right up to the creator, all the gods such as Fire, etc., all the worlds such as *Bhūḥ*, *Bhuvāḥ*, etc., all the *prāṇas* such as speech, etc., and all the souls or the *jīvas*. And it is the Brahman who has entered into all the bodies, which are like the spokes of a wheel fixed between the hub and the rim. That is why the sage, *Vāmadeva*, could realize that he 'was Manu, he was the Sun' (1.4.10). This shows that the Brahman becomes all his *upādhis*, and the realizer of the Brahman finds that he has become the *Ātman* of all, and so, he remains unaffected by anyone of them. This means that though he appears to have the phenomenal existence so far as his body is concerned, he has, at the same time, the non-phenomenal existence of Brahman. For, he too does not become bound by limitations; like the Brahman he too is without any external *upādhi*, without birth, old age and death; fearless, immovable, neither gross nor subtle, neither embodied nor disembodied. In short, he is ever the Consciousness eternal. His phenomenal and non-phenomenal aspects are equally understandable as being non-contradictory; for, the appearance of the former is *avidyā*, whereas the latter is his real nature.

The *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* (4.5) speaks of this twofold nature of Brahman as, 'It moves, it does not move; and it goes even beyond one who runs fastest'. The *Taittiriya Āraṇyaka* says about it, 'there is nothing higher or lower than it' (10.10.20). The *Sāman* sings as, 'I am the food, I am the food, I am the eater of the food' (*Tai* 3.10.5-6); the *Chāndogya* speaks about it as, one who eats, and sports, and one who becomes all smell, all *rasa*, and omniscient' (18.12.3); 'farther away than the farthest, and very near at hand,' this is also the description of the *Atharvaṇa* (*Mu* 3.1.7); in the *Kāthopaniṣad* we get, 'subtler than the subtlest, and larger than the largest' (1.2.20); and in the *Bhagavadgītā* (18.20) it is described as 'equal in all beings, and undivided amidst divided things'. Not knowing this nature of the

Brahman and of the realizer of the Brahman, many logicians and self-conceited learned men imagine that the two are according to their own liking, and say that the Ātman exists or does not exist, that he is either the doer or a mere spectator, bound or free, momentary, void, etc. Themselves being unable to cross the ocean of avidyā, they deceive others also. Those, however, who follow the scriptural path as shown by the Spiritual teacher, become able to go beyond the ocean of infatuation. 15

68. *To love the Ātman is to love all beings*

Thus, even if at this stage are over the topics of the Brahma-vidyā, and of the means of obtaining immortality about which Maitreyi had requested her husband, Yājñavalkya, to instruct her, a question arises as to what may be the purpose of the next four kaṇḍikās. The reply is that it is to exalt the glory of the Brahma-vidyā, so that immortality and the means of obtaining it could be brought within the reach of all. It would then come from the by-lanes to the royal road. Even the physicians of gods, the twin Aśvini-kumāras, had to put in tremendous efforts to learn it from a Brahmin, as it was kept a secret even by Indra himself. Secondly, though the beginning of the narration of the Brahma-vidyā started in the domain of Karma, it had to get itself free from all kinds of karma. Thirdly, when every ordinary person is seen to be engrossed in saṁsāra, Yājñavalkya got himself freed from all the pleasures of life connected with wife, sons, wealth, etc., and became content with the bliss of the Ātman only. And finally, it is the Brahma-vidyā which makes and ought to make us all dear to each other, just as Maitreyi, who was already dear to her husband, became all the more dear to him on account of her attachment to the Brahma-vidyā.

69. *The realizer of Brahma-vidyā will not be affected by Karma*

Hence, begins the kaṇḍikā sixteenth in this manner. A certain Brahmin, Dadhyāṅga atharvaṇa by name, who had known the secret of Madhu-vidyā from Indra was approached by the twin-physicians of the gods, and was requested to impart the Vidyā to them. Dadhyāṅga told them that he shall have to pay the price of his head, if he were to do so; for Indra had threatened

that his head would be chopped off the moment he divulged the secret of the Madhu-vidyā to anyone else. The twin Aśvini-kumāras assured him that he would be protected by them. Whereupon Dadhyāṅga imparted the secret of the Madhu-vidyā to them. But before this was done, they had cut off his head and preserved it, and had fixed the head of a horse in its place. Instantaneously, the Brahmin's head (now, the head of the horse) was cut off by Indra. As planned before, the Aśvini-kumāras fixed the Brahmin's own head which they had preserved upon his body, and heard through his mouth the entire secret of the Madhu-vidyā. The important point to note in this connection is that the twin-physicians did not suffer any harm in the least as a consequence of their very cruel deed, namely, the cutting the head of a Brahmin, in accomplishing their desired object, namely, the Madhu-vidyā. This constitutes the highest praise of the Brahma-vidyā (Madhu-vidyā), that when it is achieved or is being achieved, no karma, however cruel or sinful it may be, can do any harm even to the extent of the loss of a hair on the body. And this too shows how the highest merit can be attributed to Truth which, as Dadhyāṅga considered it, is of far greater importance than the saving of his own life, as was illustrated by the conduct of Dadhyāṅga. 16.17

70. *The Ātman is prototype of everything*

The content of that Madhu-vidyā is, however, this. The highest God (not the Hiraṇyagarbha) who is without any manifest names and forms produced first out of himself different worlds such as Bhūh, Bhuvaḥ, etc., and then producing bipeds and quadrupeds of different names and forms, entered into them. As he is living or lying in them, he is known as Puruṣa (who sleeps in the city of body). There is nothing in the world which he has not covered from outside or occupied from inside. In this sense also, he is known as the only one Puruṣa. He is the cause, and he is the effect; he is the names and he is the forms. 18

The sage who had seen these mantras says further that it is this highest God who not only created the innumerable forms but also became a prototype of each one of them all. That is why the quadruped begets a quadruped only, and never a biped, and a

biped begets a biped only and not a quadruped. Of course, the main purpose of this re-duplication is to show that no form is there which does not exhibit that its prototype is the Ātman. Indeed, if names and forms were not to become manifest, there would have been no chance of knowing that the Ātman is without any upādhis of names and forms. But it is these which make us aware that the Ātman must be quite different from these changing and evanescent names and forms, though he (Indra) appears to have assumed them on account of avidyā. Just as horses yoked to a chariot take the charioteer to some destined place, even so the senses which are yoked to the chariot of the body lead the soul to the objects of the senses. They are not intended to make the nature of the Ātman revealed; and so, the Ātman appears to have their nature, as also the nature of the sensuous objects. Himself, he does not reveal. In short, this self-existing Ātman appears as twofold namely, in his own eternal nirupādhic aspect; as also endowed with upādhis which being due to avidyā do not affect his real nature in the least. 19

(Here ends the fifth Brāhmaṇa of the second Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SECOND : BRĀHMAṆA SIXTH

In this Brāhmaṇa is mentioned the tradition in which the Brahma-vidyā has passed from the teachers to the disciples, from Pautimāśya Gopavana to the last sixty-seventh disciple, namely, the self-born Hiraṇyagarbha to whom by the grace of God the Vedas revealed themselves. Let us bow down before this self born Brahman. 1-3

(Here ends the sixth Brahmana as also the second Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA FIRST

We have dealt with the Madhu-kāṇḍa in which has been described the Brahma-vidyā. But this is only an incentive to further

investigation of the same truth so that the scriptural knowledge will appear to us as if it is clearly placed on our palm. Therefore, will now begin the Yājñavalkya kāṇḍa which will fully justify whatever has been told in the Madhu-kāṇḍa. What passed in the court of the King Janaka, will now be narrated in the form of a story, by which we shall know that we must worship the realizer of the Brahman, and that in order to realize the Brahman we must either do a good deal of service of the Spiritual Teacher or spend a huge amount by way of charity. The story would also tell us that in order to realize the Brahman, it is of the utmost importance to meet those who have realized it fully and have conversation with them regarding the Brahma-vidyā. This will not only sharpen the intellect, but strengthen our faith also.

There was reigning over the country of Videha, a sovereign named Janaka. He once performed a great sacrifice like Aśva-medha in which he gave away much wealth in charity to the Brahmins who had gone over there from their own countries such as that of Kurus and of the Pāṇcālas either to witness the sacrifice or to participate in its performance. Seeing the assemblage of the learned Brahmins, an idea occurred to Janaka to test as to who among them had truly realized the Brahman, and who was capable of giving a fine discourse about it. With this intention, he arranged to collect one thousand young cows in the royal cow-shed, and got tied to the two horns of each of the cows ten coins of gold. He then addressed to the Brahmins saying, 'Let anyone of you who considers himself to be steadfastly lodged in Brahman, carry away all these cows with him.' But none dared to do so except Yājñavalkya who called out his disciple Sāmaśravā and ordered him to carry away all the cows to his house. Sāmaśravā did accordingly. Seeing this boldness on the part of Yājñavalkya, all the Brahmins who had gathered there became very angry. Whereupon, thinking that he had the support of the King, Aśvala, the priest of Janaka, asked Yājñavalkya with a bit of contempt if he alone was the knower of Brahman, since what is expected of a realizer of Brahman is that he should have humility. To this, Yājñavalkya appropriately replied, 'I do bow down before the realizer of Brahman, though I am now interested in taking away the cows.' 1-2

71. *The way in which the sacrificer goes beyond death and ascends to heaven*

Addressing Yājñavalkya then Aśvala asked him, 'By what means does the performer of a sacrifice (Yajamāna) go beyond death, if karma itself is pervaded by death?' Yājñavalkya replied that 'it is by the means of Hotā (Priest), fire and speech (Agni and Vāk)'. Thereby he intended to explain that the speech of the sacrificer is the priest, and as it was already shown in the context of the three foods, the speech itself is the fire, and as the Śrutis says 'fire is the Hotā'. Now, these two means of the sacrifice, namely, the priest and the speech, which are pervaded by death in the form of karma on account of avidyā, become the very means of attaining freedom from death, if the sacrificer sees them as forms of fire. Then alone would he become free from both the adhyātmika and adhibhautika (bodily and environmental) limitations. In other words, he can be said to go beyond death. No doubt in the context of the Udgītha (1.3.12) it was told that the sight of the Chief Prāṇa constituted freedom from death; but here it is further asserted that to see the speech and the other senses as forms of the divinities of fire, etc., is to have eternal freedom from death. 3

'But how does the Yajamāna', Aśvala asked again, 'go beyond the cycles of days and nights, that is, beyond the Kāla (time) or death, since it is the kāla, who becomes the sole cause of effecting perpetual changes in the karma?' 'It is by the means of the Chief priest (the Adhvaryu), who acts as the eye and the Sun that the Yajamāna becomes free from the bondage of the day and nights, that is of the 'Kāla', replied Yājñavalkya. Explaining further, he said that Kāla has got two forms. One of them is the day and night as caused by the Sun; the other is the "tithis", that is the days and the nights of the bright and the dark halves of the month, enumerated as "Pratipadā, Dvitiyā, etc." (first, second, etc.), as caused by the moon. The days and nights or the units known as "tithis," are alone responsible for the origin, the growth, and the destruction of all things including the means and the material of the sacrifice also; and so, the days and nights are considered as Death. The eye of the sacrificer is the Chief priest, as well as the Sun in the heaven. Therefore, the moment the sacrificer gives up the limited notion that

he has got a physical eye and a human being as the chief priest, and looks upon them both as the forms of the shining Sun, he gets release from death on account of the passing of the *kāla* in the form of days and nights. Just as in the Sun there is no distinction between day and night, even so for a sacrificer who worships the Sun and becomes identified with him by looking upon his own eyes and *Adhvaryu* as verily the forms of the Sun, goes beyond time. Similarly, when the sacrificer becomes one with the moon by identifying his *prāṇa* and the *Udgātā* in the sacrifice (who sings hymns from *Sāmaveda*) with the divinity of *Vāyu*, he becomes free from the bondage of *tithis* which go on increasing and decreasing respectively in the bright and the dark fortnights of the month. For, it is the *Prāṇa* who is the real singer, and who is a form of the great element known as *Vāyu*. And just as the *Vāyu* is not bound by anything else, the worshipper also is not bound by anything including the second form of *Kalā* as determined by the moon'. It should be noted in this connection that there is some variation between the explanations of the *Kāṇvas* and the *Mādhyandins* regarding the mutual relations of *prāṇa*, *Vāyu* and the moon. Though these three are said to be essentially one and the same, the *Kāṇvas* think that *prāṇa* and *Udgātā* are the means of obtaining the divinity of *Vāyu*. The *Mādhyandins*, on the other hand, say that it is by means of *Mana* and *Brahmā* that the divinity of the moon is attained. But if we remember that the increase and decrease in the digits of the moon and of the states of the mind are due to the power of the *Vāyu* who is the *Sutrātma* (the thread) of the entire movements of the world, the apparent contradiction in the variations in the two *Śrutis* would be removed. 5

Aśvala asked again, 'By what means, O *Yājñavalkya*, does the *Yajamāna* attain the *Svargaloka* which is situated in this space as if without any support?' 'It is by the means of *Brahmā* (one of the four priests), mind and moon, that he does so', replied *Yājñavalkya*. The words 'as if' in the question of *Aśvala* show that the *Svarga* has definitely some support, though it is unknown. What is Mind in this worldly life is the divinity of the Moon; and that very moon is the priest known as the *Brahmā*. Hence, one who sees the *Brahmā* and the mind as forms of the moon, attains to *Svarga* and goes beyond death. This constitutes what is known as the '*sampat*' by which is meant that one should

contemplate that he is performing a great act such as an 'Aśvamedha sacrifice', even though he were to perform the routine works of an Agnihotrin. For instance, when the oblations of ghee would produce shining flames he should consider that he is to obtain the shining worlds of gods. In fact, it is generally supposed that persons believing in the efficacy of works are fit to imagine like this; but this really implies that they must also have the knowledge of the nature of the fruits involved in the works. For, in the absence of make-believe, works by themselves, can hardly be said to yield the fruits of the great sacrifices like Rājasūya, Aśvamedha, etc. Besides, they cannot be easily performed even by those who are fit to perform them. For instance, a Brahmin cannot easily perform it even though he is fit to do so. A Kṣatriya alone can perform a Rājasūya sacrifice. No doubt, a Brahmin can be endowed with the same fruit on account of his regular study of the Vedas and of the entire procedure regarding the performance of that sacrifice. 6

'How many Śastra-hymns', asked Aśvala again, 'will the Hotā speak out in this sacrifice?' 'He will sing three Rg-ṛcā known as "Puronuvākya" (hymns from Rgveda) before the sacrifice is begun; three others known as "Yājyā" which are used while the sacrifice is being performed, and three others known as "Śasyā" in praise of the Śastra', replied Yājñavalkya. Thereby, the sacrificer will obtain the three worlds. As for the kind and number of oblations, they would be three; those of ghee which shine brightly when they are put in fire; those of flesh, etc., which create crackling sounds; and those of milk or some juice which go down on the ground. The first will enable the sacrificer to ascend to the world of gods; the second to that of the Fathers; and the third to the mortal world of men. As for the protection given by the priest Brahmā when he takes his seat to the right-hand side of the fire (known as Āhavanīya), he does it by means of the divinity of Mind only, which like the gods known as Viśvedeva, consists of infinite states and desires. Brahmā restrains his speech by means of mind; that is, he protects the sacrifice by silent meditation only. And finally, as told by Yājñavalkya, the Udgātā (the priest who sings the sāman) repeats as mentioned above the three kinds of hymns known as Puronuvākya, Yājyā, and Śasyā. If these three kinds of hymns are contemplated as being superimposed respectively on Prāṇa

Apāna, and Vyāna, the upāsaka obtains respectively the world of the mortal beings, that of the intermediate space, and the celestial world above. 7-10

Thus, when he saw that all his questions were very satisfactorily answered by Yājñavalkya, Aśvala thought that the latter was too big a game for him, and that any argument would only bring defeat to him. He then became silent.

(Here ends the first Aśvala Brāhmaṇa of Adhyāya third of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA SECOND

Another parable is introduced in order to show how Yājñavalkya became respected on account of his Brahma-vidyā, and how Ārtabhāga failed to command any respect on account of his ignorance of the same. In other words, the parable intends to show the greatness of the Brahma-vidyā by showing the greatness of Yājñavalkya. The last Brāhmaṇa was devoted to describing how one can become free from death in the forms of kāla and karma. Now, in this Brāhmaṇa, the nature of that death is narrated, and it will be shown that it is nothing but the attachment to the beginningless ignorance which envelops all the objects of desire whether they arise on account of bodily needs or social compulsions.

72. *Prāṇa, speech, karma, upāsana and Hiranyagarbha are all bound by death*

The sense-organs and the desires that move them (graha and atigraha) constitute the nature of that death. It was told in the context of the Udgītha that the sādṛhaka who becomes free becomes lustrous like fire and Sun; but this achievement also comes under the sway of the 'graha' and the 'Atigraha' because the lustre also is affected by its contact with body, senses and their objects of desire. Even the Sūtiātmā or the Hiranyagarbha who is the Self of the Fire, Sun, etc., is overcome by death, in as much as even his great status is the result of the combination of karma and jñāna, that is of works combined with upāsana. He too is

bound by death, since there lingers in him the desire to eat. As we proceed, we shall be told even in this Brāhmaṇa that mind as the graha is over-powered by the 'atigraha', namely, the desires; that prāṇa is the graha, and that it is over-powered by the atigraha of apāna; that speech is the graha and that it is over-powered by name (Nāma). Besides, it can never be said that what is conducive to Pravṛtti or the productive of karma, including the motives and desires, can be the cause of Nivṛtti or freedom from the bondage of karma or death. The Sūtrātmā therefore is no exception to this order of things.

73. *Vidyā and avidyā can never be combined*

But there are others who hold that whatever may be the karma, it is the cause of nivṛtti. For instance, the sentence, 'one who wishes to attain to heaven should perform a sacrifice,' is capable of removing the wrong belief that the body itself is the Ātman, even though the sentence induces action. Similarly, the sentence, 'one who keeps the sacred fire should milk the cow for the sake of Darśa and Pournamāsa,' precludes one who does not keep the fire from doing so. Sleep and unclean conduct are excluded necessarily by the advice regarding the regular performance of bath, Sandhyā (worship of the Sun-god), etc. As for the prohibitory injunctions, it is obvious that they prevent man from doing certain things. Thus it is that the whole of the Karma-kāṇḍa is declared to be leading to Mokṣa by the tendency to prevent man from doing some or other kind of action. Accordingly, even one who is deeply engrossed in doing works of higher and higher order, becomes necessarily released from works of the earlier lower order. His works do aim at achieving higher and higher excellent stages in life, as if they are the steps of a stair-case to go beyond death, till he arrives at the state of the Hiranya-garbha.

All this, however, is foreign to the teachings of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and other Upaniṣads according to which the knower of Brahman becomes the Self of all. Besides, if the sentences like 'one who wishes to have cattle should perform a sacrifice', were to have the Advaitic, non-dualistic meaning, then there would be no distinction between the meanings of the word, 'cattle', 'heaven', etc. In other words, if dharma and adharam and the

various injunctions and prohibitions are meant only for the sake of obtaining liberation, then there would be nothing left as the content of this saṃsāra. It might be argued that just as a canal which is primarily used for the purpose of feeding the fields and plants, is also useful in supplying water for drinking or just as a lamp lit for the purpose of adorning the upper storey of a house might also be useful for the pedestrians, even so a sentence in Śruti might be usefully interpreted for both the mundane and the spiritual life. But this is not correct. For a sentence is meant for conveying only one meaning; and if this is available, there is no point in saying that it might mean something else also. The canal water is useful for more than one purpose is a fact of concrete, perceptual experience, but where perception is not available, and where one has to depend on the fixed and original meanings of words, it is impossible that one sentence should have two meanings, so that both Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti should be available at the same time. The words 'Vidyā' and 'avidyā' of the Īśāvāsyopaniṣad do not at all mean, as is wrongly suggested by some, that works and knowledge are to be combined. Hence, our conclusion stands, namely, that death in the forms of graha and atigraha is the bondage. How the freedom from it should be achieved is the purpose of this Brāhmaṇa.

It is also impossible to believe and to preach that one can remain in the neutral condition of neither being asleep nor of being awake, or to believe that the front portion of a hen can be used for cooking and the hind portion for laying eggs. Even so, it is impossible to believe that Karma-kāṇḍa is the cause neither of bondage nor of release. If after telling that the sādha becomes free from death, the Śruti tells us again about graha and atigraha, that is, about how the senses are overpowered by desires, it means that Śruti intends to instruct us that the latter can never confer liberation upon us. Why it does so is because one can try his best to get oneself released only when one has a thorough knowledge about one's bondage. How can ignorance about oneself that *he* is bound ever make one conscious that one should make efforts for being released? It is therefore to make us acquainted with the nature of bondage that this Brāhmaṇa is introduced here.

74. *The grahas and the atigrahas*

Aśvala being silenced, Ārtabhāga Jaratkāru came forward and asked Yājñavalkya, 'How many "grahas" and "atigrahas" are there?' Yājñavalkya replied that they are eight. Prāṇa is the graha, and it is overcome by Apāna along with smell. This means that though Prāṇa and Apāna are both of the nature of wind, it is not prāṇa but apāna (the inhaling) breath which enables one to have the smell, and can therefore be said to capture the prāṇa by means of smell. Similarly, speech (vāk), tongue (jihvā), eyes (cakṣu), ear (śrotra), mind (mana), hands (hastau) and skin (tvak) are the other seven grahas, and names (nāma), essence (rasa), form (rūpa), sound (śabda), desires (kāma), action (karma), and touch (sparśa) are the other seven atigrahas. To explain this further, Vāk, for instance, is meant for speaking words (nāma); so we can say that except speaking, it has no other function, or that it is the word which induces the Vāk to speak. But it is Vāk which being induced to speak utters words which are untrue, contradictory, indecent or horrible, and thereby instead of achieving mokṣa, becomes the source of many an evil and of bondage. In the same way, what is true of Vāk is also true of prāṇa, tongue, eye, ear, mind, hands and skin.

1-9

75. *Brahman, the Death of death*

Thereupon Ārtabhāga asked again, 'Yājñavalkya, what is divinity which feeds upon death?' Yājñavalkya replied, 'just as fire is the death of all, water becomes the death of fire, even so, the realization of Brahman (Jñāna) puts an end to the death itself'. What Ārtabhāga intended to do is to put Yājñavalkya on the horns of a dilemma. To believe that there is the death of death is to create a *regress ad infinitum*; and to deny that this is so is to accept the 'atigraha' as the only death which being of the nature of the phenomenal existence will remove all hope for being liberated. Yājñavalkya, however, believed that there is the Death of death on account of his own experience, and said that jñāna (realization of the Brahman) which is the result of the ethico-spiritual means of self-control, śravaṇa, etc., puts an end to the bondage which is inevitable in saṃsāra on account of the senses

and their desires. 10

76. *The prāṇas of the realized person merge in Brahman at the time of death*

Addressing Yājñavalkya, Ārtabhāga asked him again if the prāṇas depart or not from the dying person who is realized. 'No', replied Yājñavalkya, 'they become merged in the dying man. His body becomes swollen with outside air, and he falls dead on the ground'. The question, however, aims at knowing whether the desires which are rooted deep into the heart are destroyed or not; for if they leave the body before it falls, they would surely be the cause of re-birth, and if they do not leave, the death would not be a real one. Yājñavalkya wards off the undesirable consequences both ways. The death of the body would be real and not apparent, because the desires which merge in the dying, realized man merge in the Parabrahma who is the ultimate cause of all. The jiva of the dying realized man which is none else but the Brahman was the source of the desires, and what happens at the death of one who has realized the Brahman is that the desires along with the jivahood merge in their cause, namely, the Brahman, just as the waves which arise from the sea merge in the sea again. But whereas the waves may rise again, the desires do not; for, in the case of the realized persons, the very cause of the desires, namely, the ignorance of the Brahman is completely destroyed. Naturally, as the Śruti says (Pra. 6.5) the sixteen kalās, namely, the ten senses, the eleventh mana, and the five prāṇas all merge back into the Puruṣa (the realized person or Brahman). Thus, in short, the conclusion is that when the cause of the bondage is destroyed, the released person goes nowhere. Nay, his name also does not linger behind except in the mouths of others who continue to say about him in some such manner as 'Śuka got himself released'. In other words this continuity of name has only a phenomenal significance.

But there are others like Bhartṛprapañca and his followers who hold the view that the realizer of Brahman does not become finally released, even though his sensuous desires are destroyed, along with avidyā and karma, that is, even though his gross and subtle bodies come to an end. On the one hand he is cut off on account of his avidyā from the Paramātmān, and on the other,

he has cut himself off from the enjoyable mundane world. Therefore, the only alternative for him is to reside in the space somewhere above the region achievable by karma, known as 'Apavarga', just as a stretch of a barren, sandy land lies there as if unconcerned with the rest of the earth.

We have first to determine, however, if the person who has realized the Brahman is different or non-different from the Hiranyagarbha. Supposing that he is different, we have then to determine whether we are going to talk about the realized person who is living or of one who is dead. If he is different from the Hiranyagarbha as well as dead, that is, if all his senses have gone out of use, how can he continue the practice of śravaṇa, manana and contemplation? With the extinction of the prāṇas, the power to do so can never be revived. To suppose that the realized person is living, but that he has turned his back on saṁsāra is to indulge in saying contradictory things. When vidyā and karma, as already noticed in Adhyāya first (1.4.10) are the cause of the enjoyments available to Hiranyagarbha, how can they be said as being capable of destroying the same? What then must be the cause of his desire to turn away from saṁsāra, except the full realization of the Brahman? And, if, according to the third alternative, we are to suppose that the person who has realized the Ātman, is dead, his prāṇas become merged in himself and he becomes one with the Hiranyagarbha. Therefore he becomes fit to abandon the enjoyments of the sensible world. How can then the Vidyā and Karma be said as before to be capable of achieving the status of the saṁsāri Hiranyagarbha and yet be capable of giving up the saṁsāra altogether? How can that which helps a thing to be in motion arrest its motion at the same time? And who will then instruct the ordinary men so that they too should realize the Brahman? Brahma-vidyā is meant not for a selected few, but for all, for men and for gods. 11-12

Then, again, there comes finally a question from Ārtabhāga, 'where does the Puruṣa retire, Yājñavalkya, when, at the time of death, his speech merges in fire, prāṇas merge in wind, the eyes in the sun, the mind in the moon, the ears in the quarters, the body in the earth, the space of the heart in the elemental sky outside, the hair in the plants and herbs, and the blood and the semen in water?' It is not desirable to discuss the question in a

crowd; so come, dear Ārtabhāga, with me, let us discuss it in solitude', replied Yājñavalkya. Saying so, and holding Ārtabhāga by hand, Yājñavalkya went to a solitary place, and thought deeply over the question, as several persons belonging to schools of the Mīmāṃsakas, Cārvāka, Astronomists, believers in Karma-kāṇḍa, Devatā-kāṇḍa, Vijñānavādins and Nihilists, have spoken respectively about Svabhāva-vāda (naturalism), Kāla, Karma, Fate, Vijñāna and Void. Ārtabhāga and Yājñavalkya thought about these several possibilities as the cause of the world, as also of their being the resting place of the realized person after his death. They came however to the conclusion that notwithstanding these accessory causes, Karma alone is the central topic with which all these are concerned. It is karma, they thought which being either meritorious or sinful renders the doer of it also as meritorious or sinful. Whereupon Ārtabhāga became silent. 13

(Here ends the second Ārtabhāga Brāhmaṇa of the third Adhyāya of the Brhadāranyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD: BRĀHMAṆA THIRD

So far we have come to the conclusion that Karma is either meritorious or sinful and it is on account of this karma that the ordinary persons who are merged in saṃsāra come to birth again and again, but that the realizer of Brahman becomes forever free from saṃsāra because all his karma and desires are destroyed by the power of his realization. One might however, contend that meritorious karma is the means by which are obtained not only the three ends of human life, namely, Dharma, Artha and Kāma, but also the fourth, namely Mokṣa. But whereas karma ends in fruits which are endowed with names and forms, mokṣa is not the result of any cause. It is devoid of destruction as also devoid of names, forms, actions, means and the fruits of any kind. As such, karma has no place in it. To emphasise this and thereby show that the scope of karma is the scope of saṃsāra including even the realm of Prajāpati, is the purpose of this Brāhmaṇa.

77. *Jñāna removes ignorance of Reality, Karma does not, even if it is combined with upāsana*

There are people who say that though karma by itself is the cause of bondage, it can also be the cause of mokṣa, if it is done along with knowledge (Vidyā) and without being attached to its fruits. But this is not correct; for, mokṣa can never be considered as a thing capable of being accomplished by the beginning of some action. It is nothing but freedom from bondage and avidyā, and consists of jñāna, that is the realization of Brahman. Karma is seen to be useful in producing things, in making them available, in modifying and in moulding them. Mokṣa which is the eternal, spotless, qualityless Ātman is not concerned with anyone of these four. One might say that just as poison or curds, which by itself might end in death or fever, changes its nature and becomes the cause of strengthening life, if it is mixed with sugar or administered with the help of some powerful mantra, even so karma may lead one to mokṣa if it is done with knowledge and is bereft of desires for fruits. But this is an arbitrary belief for which there is no support of any valid means of knowledge, such as perception, inference, etc.

Resorting to Arthāpatti (the method of the *reductio ad absurdum*) as the method of proof one might say that just as it is inferred about a man, who does not eat by day but who grows stronger and stronger, that he must be eating by night, even so the routine karma, such as sandhyā which is enjoined for a Brahmin, but of which no fruit is mentioned, ought to be thought of as the cause of mokṣa alone. But this too is not correct. For, wherever there is some scriptural injunction for doing some routine action but no fruit is mentioned, it is to be presumed by common consent that the person who is enjoined to do that karma expects to attain to Svarga. There need not be mokṣa as the only effect or fruit arrived at by the process of elimination. In fact, though mokṣa is said to be the effect of jñāna, it is so only by courtesy. For, mokṣa is jñāna, that is, the realization of Brahman itself; in other words, it is the realization of one's own real Self; and what it does is what jñāna does, namely, to remove the curtain of ignorance (ajñāna). This cannot be done by karma; because there is no incompatibility between karma and ajñāna, as there is between jñāna (realization) and karma.

To insist, inspite of this, in arguing that karma removes ignorance in an indirect and invisible manner, will not also be helpful. For, when the effects of karma are directly visible, why should one imagine them as unseen and probable in character? When it is a matter of direct experience that the husk over the grains of rice is removed by beating the rice, is it necessary to imagine that it is removed in an unseen manner by the performance of the routine duties of an *agnihotri*? Even if karma is combined with *Vidyā* (*upāsana*), as in the case of *Hiraṇyagarbha*, it will never be able to remove the ignorance about the nature of Brahman; for, then it has reference only to the region of the gods. And if at all one wishes to indulge in imagining unseen effects of routine works, why should one go to such an extremity as to imagine effects which are diametrically opposite in nature, and not be content with effects as production, obtainment, modification, etc. which are not incompatible with karma?

Besides, if the *nitya karma* (routine duties) also results in having some other fruits, it cannot be said that *Mokṣa* alone which remains to be accounted for, should be considered as the fruit of the *nitya karma*. In fact, even as a fruit, *mokṣa* is altogether different in kind from the infinite number of other fruits which become the objects of human desires, and which are dependent on different means and on different conditions of space, time, and circumstances, as well as on the likes and dislikes of men. In view of this, will there be any sense in saying that *mokṣa* is the only fruit which remains as the residual and is therefore the only conceivable result of the *nitya karmas*? Neither can *mokṣa* be considered as one which can be produced, or as one which can be modified or moulded, just as the sacrificial pole is cut into an octagonal shape and its external face made smooth by the application of ghee, etc., or just as the fire which is going to be lit for the performance of a sacrifice, or the material for it is purified by sprinkling over it the sacred water. *Mokṣa* being one and non-dual, it cannot be considered as something obtainable by some means or other.

It is just possible that *nitya karma* may, on account of different motives, be considered as *naimittika* (occasional) only. For instance, when the house is on fire, or when an undesirable, unordained cutting of plants, or some injury is done, they are

attended upon by certain acts which wash away the evil effects of them. But as there is no fundamental difference between nitya and naimittika actions, and as both of them have reference to the well-being of human life, mokṣa cannot be said to be their result. Light is necessary for being aware of the forms of objects in general. But owls do not require light for seeing the objects. Does this therefore mean that man sees by his eyes, and the owls hear or taste by their eyes? Though there is difference between the eyes of man and the eyes of the owls, there is no difference in their capacity to see. Even so, whether they are the nitya or the naimittika karmas, they are just the same like all other karmas. As such, mokṣa cannot be the result of anyone of them. If, however, as suggested above by the pūrva-pakṣa, the nitya karmas were to fructify in altogether a different manner on account of their being free from the taint of desires, and if they are fortified by upāsana (vidyā), it would certainly be welcome to all, just as poison also would be welcome if it becomes useful for saving life on account of the counteracting power of some mantra.

78. *An Ātmayāji is better than a Devayāji*

This is accepted even by Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa which says that an 'Ātmayāji', that is one who does works without any desire for fruits for the well-being of his own self, is far better than a 'Devayāji' who with the view to fulfilling his desires propitiates the gods. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad also it is stated that karma becomes endowed with power if it is supported by vidyā (upāsana). This only shows that for an Ātmayāji works combined with upāsana become helpful to purify his mind and make him fit for possessing Ātmajñāna which, according to Manu, consists in seeing the Ātman in all the beings and all the beings in the Ātman. But what is needed for Ātmajñāna over and above the works and upāsana, which by themselves are concerned with the fruits available in saṁsāra, is the knowledge of the unity of the Self and the Ātman by means of Śravaṇa, Manana and the constant practice of it. What vidyā and karma might together achieve, in spite of the bondage which they will cause, is the attainment of sattvaguṇa, or the glory of the gods, but not mokṣa. So, what is important to note is that just as not to do what is ordained by the scriptures or to do what is prohibited by

them ends only in obtaining the births of manes, animals, and immovable beings like trees, etc., even so all good works and upāsanās will end only in giving us excellent fruits in saṁsāra, including even the status of Brahmā, etc.

What is sometimes said by speaking some such statement as 'we have drunk the Soma juice and have therefore become immortal', need not be taken as literally true, though it is a Śruti passage; for, it goes against actual experience. Who would believe if one were to say that fire is cold and makes things wet? The drinking of Soma like all meritorious actions done even in Svarga will, in course of time, lose their power just as actions done in this world will be ineffective in course of time. But which of the two or more contending statements is true has ultimately to be determined by reference to actual, concrete experience, and not by the ordinarily known valid means of knowledge, such as the sensuous perception, inference, etc. One may indulge in saying that the glowworm is fire, or that the sky is coloured or dirty, but the wise know that this is only an appearance. Even so, the Advaitic statement that 'Brahman alone is real' might appear to be contradicted by ordinary perceptual or inferential knowledge, but this must be judged from the viewpoint of the realizer of Brahman. The advaitic knowledge of Brahman does not depend on the dexterity of human intelligence, but on the meaning conveyed by the words in the statement itself, and found to be correct and appropriate by reference to the commonly accepted six criteria of truth such as the beginning and the end of the topic concerned, and so on. The opinions of the interpreters do not make the Vedic sentences mean differently. The conclusion we have now arrived therefore is that mere karma or karma with upāsanā does not lead us to mokṣa. They produce only the fruits of saṁsāra; and it is to emphasize this that the present Brāhmaṇa is introduced.

The story goes on by telling us further that a certain Brāhmaṇa Bhujyu Lāhyāyani then came forward and told Yājñavalkya that after finishing his studies while he was going through the Madra country, he came to the house of Patañcali Kapi. Finding there that Patañcali's daughter was possessed, he asked the spirit as to who he was. The spirit replied that he was a Gandharva, by name Sudhanvā. Bhujya asked him as to what the dimensions of the entire universe were and where the Pāriṣitas

had gone; and then turning to Yājñavalkya, Bhujyu asked him if he knew what that Gandharva had told him; and if not, would Yājñavalkya accept his defeat. 1

Yājñavalkya replied that the Pārikṣitas had gone to the region where the earlier Pārikṣitas, that is, where the performers of the Aśvamedha sacrifice had gone. On being further asked as to what that region was, Yājñavalkya replied that it was the region encircled by Lokāloka mountains, and covered by as large a space as can be covered by thirty-two times of the space covered by the chariot of the Sun in one day and night. There, in that Loka (region) resides the Virāṭ Puruṣa and there the various karmas (including the Aśvamedha) begin to bear fruit. Then, Indra, that is, the sacrificial fire, assumes the form of a bird with beautiful wings. He then carries all the performers of the Aśvamedha sacrifice (the Pārikṣitas) with him, hands them over to Vāyu, because he himself having a visible form cannot get any entrance into that region. Vāyu being invisible goes anywhere unhindered; and so he carries the Pārikṣitas there. Yājñavalkya ended his reply by saying that one who knows the Vāyu as the Ātman, does not die more than once. Hearing this Bhujyu became silent. 2

(Here ends the third Brāhmaṇa of the third Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA FOURTH

Having told in the Ārtabhāga Brāhmaṇa that the jīva never leaves away his sensuous desires (graha and atigraha) and that therefore he wanders from birth to birth, doing all the while meritorious and sinful actions, and having also told in the Bhujyu Brāhmaṇa that the status of the Hiraṇyagarbha as the fruit of the sacrifices like the Aśvamedha is the highest glory one can achieve in this world of names and forms, the Upaniṣad now proceeds to consider in this fourth Uṣasta Brāhmaṇa whether that jīva really exists or not. In other words, what is sought to be inquired is the nature of that very jīvātman who, as we shall be told in the next Kahola Brāhmaṇa, is the cause of the freedom from bondage, provided one sees himself face to face and discovers

that the Ātman is not contaminated by any kind of upādhi or karma.

‘Explain clearly unto me, O Yājñavalkya’, says Uṣasta Cākrāyaṇa, ‘how the Brahman who is non-different and cannot be hidden from the seer of the Brahman is the same as the immanent Ātman in all. Do not tell me that the ear or the mind is the Brahman; for, that will not be the chiefest of all. And convince me in the manner in which the owner of a cow convinces others by holding it by the horns’. Yājñavalkya replied, ‘This your own Ātman is the inner Self of all, and who therefore is the chiefest, the direct, the unhindered Brahman, and on account of whose presence your body and senses are (erroneously) called by the same name, Ātman.’ Thereupon Uṣasta asked again as to ‘which of the three Ātmans, namely, the external gross body, the internal subtle body consisting of the senses, and the innermost spectator about whose nature there lingers always a doubt, do you think is my real Ātman?’ ‘He is your Ātman’, replied Yājñavalkya, ‘by which your prāṇa moves through your nostrils and mouth, by which all the movements of your inconscient body and the senses are made, and who therefore is of different nature from them all. He is your Ātman, by which Apāna, Vyāna, and Udāna also function well. He is the Vijñānamaya Ātman in you, the inner Self of all.’ 1

At this Uṣasta Cākrāyaṇa said with surprise. ‘How is it that after accepting to show me the Ātman directly, you are only indicating to me its nature by certain signs such as its being the cause of the functions of prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, etc. This is like giving information about a bull that he walks, or about a horse that he runs, after promising first to show the bull or the horse. Give up your pretension, O Yājñavalkya, of being the realizer of Brahman, under the pretext of carrying away the cows, or explain to me distinctly, clearly, and directly the nature of the Ātman who you say is the inner Self of all.’

79. The sight of the Ātman is neither produced nor destroyed

‘I am doing exactly as I promised you to do’, replied Yājñavalkya. ‘But it is not possible to hold the Ātman by hand and show it to you like jars and other perceptible things, because unlike them the Ātman can never become the object of sight or of any other

sense. He is the witness of all other things, and this is his unique characteristic. Like a lamp in our ordinary daily life the sight is useful to show us other things, but not the seer of the sight. Unfortunately, the Buddhists deny the very existence of this seer of sight, because He is not seen by our ordinary senses. It should be remembered, however, that there are two kinds of sight; one, the sight of the eyes which brings about a certain state of the mind which is created as well as destroyed. But the other, which is the sight of the Ātman, is neither produced nor destroyed, but exists in its own nature like the heat and the light of fire. That he is called as the seer, the hearer, the thinker, is because there are the innumerable upādhis in the form of objects, sounds, etc., on account of which are created various states of mind which are superimposed upon him. The eternal subject or the power to see, hear, etc., is then called as the seer, the hearer, etc. In other words, the Ātman appears to become its own world of various objects and states of mind. These are, as if, seen by him, and so he is called the seer, the hearer, etc. In fact, whenever the eye comes in contact with the source of sight, namely, the Ātman, we say that the eye sees, but the so-called eye-sight sometimes sees the objects and sometimes not. It is due to the superimposition of this ordinary sight upon that eternal source or the Ātman, that there springs up the wrong belief that the Ātman sometimes sees and sometimes not. Whenever there arises a state of mind corresponding to perception, or whenever it vanishes, it is usually said that the Ātman (the jiva) sees or does not see, even though with or without the perception, the Ātman remains eternally the source of sight. That this capacity of the Ātman to see, hear, think, etc., can have no change in it, or that it can never disappear will again be discussed in the fourth adhyāya. But, for the present, we are told by Yājñavalkya the same thing, namely, that the ordinary perception, which can have the awareness of a bull or a horse, and which therefore involve the distinctions of subject, object and the karma of seeing, will never be able to apprehend its own source, namely, the eternal Ātman, which is without any distinctions.

Some, however, following Bhartṛprapañca, interpret 'draṣṭeḥ draṣṭāraṁ na paśyeh' as 'do not see the author of sight without understanding the difference between the seer and the sight'. But this is not correct. For, they do not understand that thereby they

would make the word 'dṛṣṭeḥ' as either having no meaning or superfluous, inasmuch as the word 'draṣṭāraṁ' involves both the seeing and the subject who sees. Besides, it is not necessary that one must be aware of the difference between the seer and the sight prior to the vision of the Seer. In fact, the sight of the Seer is the Seer himself, and *vice versa*. The use of the root 'dṛś' (to see) twice in *dṛṣṭeḥ draṣṭāraṁ* is to make us aware that the ordinary, sensuous perception which involves the distinction of subject and object is altogether different from the non-sensuous sight which is none else than the Seer himself. So, what the words 'draṣṭā' (seer), 'śrotā' (hearer), 'mantā' (thinker), etc., mean is that it is the jīva who has the ordinary perception due to eyes and ears, and the capacity to think by his mind. They do not suggest that the Ātman is the seer, the hearer or the thinker; for, as we shall see later on (in Adhyāya fourth) it is, as if, the Ātman who sees, hears or thinks.

At this, Uṣasta Cākrāyaṇa came to know that all else except the Ātman is perishable; and so, he became silent. 2

(Here ends the fourth Brāhmaṇa of Adhyāya third of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA FIFTH

The first three Brāhmaṇas of this adhyāya were devoted to the delineation of how the bondage takes place on account of avidyā and its accessories. In the fourth it was given to understand that the real nature of that bound jīva is altogether different from that of the body and the senses with which he is associated. And, now in the fifth Kahola Brāhmaṇa will be described the nature of the Ātmajñāna along with sannyāsa as the means of freedom from bondage. It was with this view that Kahola asked Yājñavalkya to tell him clearly about that immanent Ātman who is also the directly realizable Brahman, and to whom Yājñavalkya replied that it was the same Ātman of Kahola.

80. *The Uṣasta and the Kahola Brāhmaṇas aim at two different things*

The belief of Bhartṛprapañca and his followers is that though it appears that one and the same question is asked by Uṣasta and Kahola in this as well as in the preceding Brāhmaṇas what Uṣasta wanted to know was about the nature of the Kṣetrajña (the jīva who occupies the body) while Kahola was anxious to know the nature of the Paramātmān. But this is not correct. For, it is not possible that one body should contain in it two Ātmans. That is why Yājñavalkya speaks in both the cases of one Ātman only by saying, 'this your Ātman'. Bodies may be different, yet in all of them the awareness of the Ātman remains one only, namely, the awareness of the 'I'. Besides, corresponding to the bodies, if the ātmans were to be different, one of them would be the immanent and the chief Brahman, while the others would be non-immanent, subordinate and inconscient objects like jars and other things. But this looks absurd on the face of it. It will therefore be proper to hold that both the Brāhmaṇas, are interested in knowing the one Ātman only, but with two different motives, which, however, are not explicitly mentioned in the two Brāhmaṇas.

This difference between the two motives of the two Brāhmaṇas can be stated thus. The question of Kahola and a part of the answer by Yājñavalkya up to 'this immanent Ātman in you', has the same import as the question and answer in the earlier Brāhmaṇa has. But the latter portion of Yājñavalkya's answer makes the difference between the two motives quite clear. That the Ātman is altogether different from the body and the senses was the verdict of the Uṣasta Brāhmaṇa; that he is different from being a transmigratory soul, and that he goes beyond hunger and thirst is the verdict of the Kahola Brāhmaṇa. Bereft of upādhis, the Ātman is not at all a saṁsāri jīva; but, being superimposed by them, he appears to be so. Just as the rope, the shell and the ākāśa appear respectively to be, a serpent, silver, or a coloured expanse, even so the Ātman appears to be different on account of the superimposition of qualities different from him. So, there is no real contradiction between the two conditions of the Ātman. The upādhis of nāma and rūpa (names and forms) can never be able to change the nature of the Ātman who is one and non-dual, just as the foam and bubbles do not change the nature of water.

Here, one might point out that nāma and rūpa seem to be the effects of the Ātman, just as foam and bubbles are of water. But even this possibility of there being an effect as distinct from its cause will be ruled out, if we take some other illustration to point out the nature of the Ātman. The ornaments are nothing else but gold; the jars are nothing else but the earth, though there are various forms and names of the ornaments and of the jars. Look at the names and forms, and there is saṁsāra and manyness; look at the substance, gold or earth, there is Parmārtha (the Reality) and no saṁsāra. Either have the manifoldness of saṁsāra as effects, or the unity of cause, namely the Brahman. As only the viewpoints differ, there will be no contradiction. Looked at from the viewpoint of the Brahman, there will be one cause only and no effects, though we may not be able to call it even as cause. So far as the practical life is concerned, the ignorant and the wise will both admit that there are differences and distinctions among things and things; but the wise never will accept that they are real during the condition of the realization of the Brahman.

On being asked as to what that immanent Ātman is, Yājñavalkya said 'he who goes beyond hunger, thirst, desires, temptations, old age and death is the very immanent Ātman in you O Kahola. What is suggested thereby is that though all these characteristics are seen to belong to the embodied persons, they do not belong to the Brahman, inasmuch as it is one and bereft of any upādhis of body and senses. As such, the view that there are innumerable jivas has got only phenomenal significance. The realizer of the Brahman goes beyond 'śoka' and 'moha' which have their roots in the mind and are the causes of desires and wrong notions. These constitute what is known as avidyā. Therefore it is that the wise (Brahmin), who wishes to realize the Brahman abandons the desires for having progeny, wealth and fame. Neither will he hanker after obtaining wealth in the form of cattle and other property, nor the world of the Fathers by using this wealth in a sacrifice, nor again in the worlds of the gods by means of Karma and upāsana (vidyā). But the obtaining of the Brahma-vidyā however, will be the main strength of the realizer of the Brahman, on account of which, he can give up everything else, including desires for the pleasures of life and the means of obtaining them. In fact, the desire to

adopt certain means involves in it the desires for fruits. To say that one has no desires for fruits, but that he wishes to adopt all the means which are necessary for their obtainment has no meaning except that he does wish to have the fruits. No one who does not wish to have them will ever undertake to adopt the means. So, it is the means which act as a common factor to all the three desires (eṣaṇās) regarding progeny, wealth, and fame.

81. *The real Sannyāsa is one which is supported by Ātmajñāna*

Therefore the Brahmins of the olden times who had no other desire except the realization of the Brahman used to give up all karma as well as the means of doing it. But this kind of renunciation would only yield them as described in the Smṛtis, the various fruits which are useful for the maintenance of livelihood, whether the āśrama embraced is sannyāsa or not. They even used to give up the external signs such as the sacred thread (Yajñopavita), but thereby they could only show to the world that what goes by the name of sannyāsa, as described in the Smṛtis, is not the real sannyāsa. As the main business of the human life ought to be the realization of the Ātman, and as the inculcation of this instruction is the only purpose of this Upaniṣad, the real sannyāsa would mean that which is supported by Ātmajñāna.

All advice regarding means like the Yajñopavita and the actions like Vedic study, etc., is meant for the ignorant people who accept sannyāsa for the obtainment of fruits only. We shall thereby move only in the domain of desires, and so shall never be free from avidyā. The first and the foremost duty therefore of a Brahmin is to realize the Brahman; and then, supported by the strength of this realization, he should give up everything else. This will constitute the real sannyāsa. And, then, for the sake of keeping his body and soul together, he may go on begging the alms. The kind of sannyāsa then which is born out of Ātmajñāna is the only genuine sannyāsa, and is altogether different from the sannyāsa which is recommended as the fourth and the final stage of the human life, that is, one which comes after having passed through the three earlier stages of celibacy (Brahmacarya), householder (Gārhastha) and of an anchorite

(Vānaprastha). It is, however, very important to remember that to embrace sannyāsa is a very useful adjunct of Ātmajñāna. For, thereby not only one is prevented from going back again into saṁsāra, but he is also immensely helped to keep himself lodged in Brahman. So, it is immaterial when the realizer of Brahman enters into the fold of the sannyāsins. He may do so at the end or during the condition of Brahmacharya or at any time later on, provided he is on the path towards the realization of Brahman. In short, it is the genuine sannyāsa only which strengthens the Brahmajñāna; and as the begging of the alms is for the sake of keeping the body alive and efficient for the purpose of śravaṇa, manana, etc., it too is highly useful for keeping the Brahmajñāna without being clouded by avidyā, and for having a check upon the natural tendency of the mind to accept gifts which might only increase the greed of man.

83. *Vairāgya, morality and Ātmajñāna are interdependent*

Thus should a Brahmin wish to have the full realization of Brahman and live continuously contemplating upon it. As said above, the real sannyāsa is born out of Ātmajñāna; but here, we may be told that the knowledge about the Ātman would never arise unless there arises first the disgust for all other objects of desire. But this is no contradiction; for, to some extent, the two are interdependent. Vairāgya, though initial, is necessary for the emergence and perfection of Ātmajñāna; and as the latter becomes more and more permanent, disgust for other objects becomes more and more intense. And then it is that there would arise the genuine sannyāsa. A person who is endowed with these qualities can be called a Brāhmaṇa. To ascertain by means of service of the Guru that Brahman alone is the Reality is knowledge (Pāṇḍitya); to become disgusted with all other objects of desire is the strength (bala) of that knowledge; to contemplate constantly upon the truth 'I am the Brahman and nothing else, is the 'mauna' (silence of speech)'; and to be able to experience directly the Brahman is the 'Brāhmaṇya', or the condition of being a Brahmin in the true sense of the word. The manner of living of such a realized person might appear strange as it is not determined by any particular standard, but it can never be wayward or immoral; nor will it be

deliberately against the accepted mode of living a good and moral life. If purity of conduct is an essential condition of the obtainment of Brahmajñāna, it must continue to be so for the maintenance of that highest Brahmanic life. I

(Here ends the fifth Kahola Brāhmaṇa of the third Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA SIXTH

84. *Gārgi becomes silent due to fear of death*

Then came forward Gārgī Vācaknavī, daughter of Vacaknu. Addressing Yājñavalkya, she said that the earth and all the objects on it are enveloped and penetrated on all sides by water just as a piece of cloth consists of the warp and woof of threads. What she intended to suggest was that anything which is gross and limited is penetrated and enveloped by what is subtler and less limited than it, namely, its cause. Therefore she asked as to what that might be which must have penetrated and enveloped water. Yājñavalkya replied that it is Vāyu. In fact, water comes out of fire. But instead of saying that fire envelopes water, Yājñavalkya said that it was Vāyu, since fire resides in wood and is not seen till the wood is ignited. He mentioned therefore not the immediate cause of water but the cause of cause, namely, the Vāyu which is perceptible independently of anything else. Upon this Gārgī asked, 'What is that in which Vāyu is contained?' 'It is the space (ākāśa)', replied Yājñavalkya. Gārgī continued to ask in the same manner regarding the causes which have enveloped the space, the world of the Gandharvas, the Sun (Āditya), the moon, the stars, the region of the gods, the Indraloka and Prajāpati. Yājñavalkya too answered her questions by saying that space is contained in Gandharvaloka, that in the Sun, and so on, until finally he told her that the world of Prajāpati is contained in the Brahmaloка. Gārgī, however, again asked as to what is that in which Brahmaloка is contained. Yājñavalkya said in reply, 'Do not, O Gārgī, go beyond the limits of inferential knowledge. For the Divinity about whom you are asking is beyond the scope of inference; and so, if you

do not wish that your head should fall, desist from asking further about the Deity who is to be realized and not discussed about.' At this, fearing death, Gārgi became silent.

What this and the next two Brāhmaṇas are intended to convey us is to ascertain further the nature of the Antarātman, which has been already discussed to some extent in the preceding two Brāhmaṇas. It is the innermost, immanent Ātman, the Brahman, who is the ultimate cause of upholding all the five elements and the several worlds including that of the Prajāpati.

(Here ends the sixth Brāhmaṇa of the third Adhyāya of the
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA SEVENTH

85. *Vāyu is the Sūtrātmā; and the Antaryāmin (the inner Self) of all.*

The sixth Brāhmaṇa was devoted to the description of all the pervading entities upto the Sūtrātmā, the divinity about whom Gārgi had asked the question as to what it was by which he was pervaded. Now, this Brāhmaṇa is concerned regarding the Antaryāmin of that very Sūtrātmā. Though Gārgi had become silent due to the fear of death, there came forward Uddālaka Āruṇi, the son of Aruṇa, and addressing Yājñavalkya, he began to narrate an incident in his life. 'I was once residing in the house of Patañjali Kāpya in the Madra country, for the purpose of studying the Yājñasastra. The wife of that Kāpya was possessed by a Gandharva, Kabandha by name, and the son of one Atharvaṇa. Once, the Gandharva asked Patañcala if he knew well that Sūtra which upholds all the beings and all their present and future births, like a thread which keeps together the beads of a garland. 'No sir, I do not know that Sūtra', replied the Kāpya. The Gandharva asked him again if he knew the innermost Ātman (antaryāmin) by whose power all the beings and all their births are upheld. 'No, sir, I do not know', was again the reply of the Kāpya. The Gandharva then told him that one who knows that Sūtra and the Antaryāmin within him as controlling all the beings and all their births, becomes the

Knower of all the beings, of all the worlds, and of the Ātman who is the doer and enjoyer of everything that happens. Then being tempted by this description of the knower of the Sūtra and of the antaryāmin within, we all, Patañcala and his students, stood with humility before the Gandharva. He then imparted us the knowledge of that Sūtra and the Antaryāmin. I therefore possess that knowledge. But if you do not know that, and still if you make yourself bold to carry away the cows under the pretext that you are the knower of Brahman, then remember, O Yājñavalkya, that by the power of my curse your head will fall. At this, Yājñavalkya told that he knew the Sūtra as well as the Antaryāmin within. 'Why, any man might say like that even without knowing. So, if at all you know, then prove that you know it,' was the challenge of Uddālaka Āruṇi, known as Gautama. 1

'Vāyu is that Sūtra; for by his power are held up all these beings and their births. That is why, O Gautama, when a man dies, that is, when the Vāyu leaves him, all his limbs become powerless. Being subtle like ākāśa, it is the support of the earth and of other beings: it is even the "Lingadeha", the subtle body consisting of five elements, ten sense-organs, prāṇa and antaḥkaraṇa; in short, it consists of both the cosmos and the acosmos. 'Yes, you have described the Sūtra correctly; now say, O Yājñavalkya, about the Antaryāmin', said Āruṇi. 2

'That who lives within the divinity of earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body and senses are the earth itself, who controls the earth and makes it active, is the Antaryāmin. Being ever free, he has no desire and no karma of his own; he lives for the sake of others. And he is the Ātman in you, in me, and in all the beings and is altogether different from the transmigratory jivas. 3

'Again, that who resides within water, whom the divinity of water does not know, whose body and senses are water, who controls that divinity from within, is the very Ātman who is also your Ātman and is immortal. Similarly, again, who lives in the divinities of Fire, Vāyu (wind), the celestial world, the Sun, the directions, the moon and the stars, the ākāśa, the darkness, the light, the entire beings, the prāṇa, the speech, the eyes, the ears, the mind, the skin, the Vijnāna, and the semen, that is the immortal Ātman in you, in me and in all the beings.

He is the Seer, though he is not seen by the eyes; he is the hearer though not heard by the ears; he whose thinking power is never eclipsed, though he is himself inconceivable by the mind; and he is the Vijñātā, since he resides in the intellect of all the beings, though he himself remains unknown to all. Therefore none but him is the Antaryāmin; none but him, the Seer, the hearer, the thinker and the knower; none else who is immortal and different from the saṁsārī jivas. Any thing or anyone other than this Antaryāmin is perishable.' Hearing this Uddālaka Āruṇi became silent. 23.

(Here ends the seventh Brāhmaṇa of the third Ādhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : BRĀHMAṆA EIGHTH

86. *Gārgi being pleased, salutes Yājñavalkya*

There came forward Vācaknavī again, though she had retired from the field due to the fear that her head might fall on account of a possible curse from Yājñavalkya. Obtaining permission from the Brahmins she said to Yājñavalkya, 'Here I am standing before you with the intention of asking you two questions which will be as difficult for you to answer as it would be for the enemy to meet the arrows of a warrior from the country of Kāshi or Videha. As you are professing that you have realized the Brahman and have allowed the cows to be carried away, you must answer my questions.' Turning to the other Brahmins she said, 'If Yājñavalkya would give satisfactory answers to my two questions, none of you should ever think of defeating him.'

After having ascertained what the Sūtra and the Antaryāmin within it are in the preceding Brāhmaṇa what the Upaniṣad intends to achieve in this Brāhmaṇa by means of the two questions of Vācaknavī, is to show that the upādhiless and the directly visible Brahman is ever free and uncontaminated from hunger, thirst and all other qualities. Vācaknavī therefore put forth her first question thus: 'There is, O Yājñavalkya, the celestial world above the upper half of the egg in the form of

this universe; below the lower half of it there is the earth; and between the two halves there is the intermediary region. Now, tell me what is that in which all that is above, below and in the middle as well as all that has happened in the past, is happening at present and will happen in the future, is thoroughly contained.' Yājñavalkya replied, 'All that which you have described, O Gārgī, is none else but the Sūtra about which I have already said. Like the earth in water, it is contained in the unmanifest Ākāśa, and resides there only during all the three times, that is, during the periods of origination, continuation and dissolution.' Being pleased with the reply Gārgī said, 'I salute you, revered Yājñavalkya, because you have said what is most difficult to express, namely, about both the Sūtra and that in which the Sūtra is contained.' Gārgī must have first thought that it was difficult to say anything about Ākāśa, since it transcends the past, the present and the future, and that, secondly, that in which, the Ākāśa is contained namely, (the Akṣara) is all the more difficult to express. And therefore, she must have thought that Yājñavalkya being ignorant about both, might either be silent on the point or give only a ranciful answer. So she asked him her second question. 'What is that in which the Ākāśa is thoroughly contained?'

87. *The Akṣara Brahman is upādhiless, uncontaminated and directly visible*

Yājñavalkya replied that it is Akṣara; and those who have realized the Brahman also say that it is Akṣara, meaning thereby it does neither perish nor decay. It is different from being gross, or from being subtle; from being short or long. Thus did he show that the Akṣara cannot be said to be a substance having dimensions. 'It is neither red', said he, 'just as the fire is red; nor does it possess the quality of water, namely, sneha; being thoroughly indescribable, it cannot cast its shadow; nor can it be dark in colour; neither it is wind nor ākāśa; being uncontaminable, it is not sticky; it is devoid of any *rasa* or smell; it is eyeless but sees; it is earless but hears; it is without speech or mind; it has no perceptible light like that of the Sun; it is not the prāṇa in the body, nor does it have any mouth; itself being measureless, it does not

measure anything, it is indivisible, continual and without any holes in it; there is nothing external to it; neither does it eat anything, nor is it capable of being eaten by anyone.' Thus, Yājñavalkya told her that it is one non-dual, and devoid of any quality. Nothing in short, can be attributed to it. 8

88. *Categories of Substance and Duality are inapplicable to the Brahman*

In view of the ordinary notion that all existing things are qualified in some way or other, it is likely that one might think that because the conceptions of substance and quality are inapplicable to the Akṣara, it does not exist at all. Therefore, in order to remove this wrong notion, Yājñavalkya further says that it is by the controlling power of this Akṣara that the Sun and the moon, in spite of their certain independence, are upheld in their orbits and made to shine over the worlds, as if they are like the servants of a king. The earth and the celestial world too, in spite of their being independent divinities, are held up by the controlling power of this Akṣara, so that they do not fall away and break into pieces. It is by the controlling power of this Akṣara that time is measured by minutes, hours, days, nights, fortnights, months, seasons and years, and that divisions of it are made into the past, the present and the future. Even the divinities of rivers cannot flow in any other direction except in that which is ordered by this Akṣara. Therefore it is that some rivers have their rise in the snow-covered mountains and flow eastward, and some flow westward. And, O Gārgi, it is this Akṣara, and not any 'apūrva' or the unseen, accumulated effect of any karma, whether it is the charity of wealth or the performance of a sacrifice which has the power to distribute the fruits. Karma is decidedly momentary; and the fruit of it is obtained at some future time; therefore one who connects the karma with the fruit is neither anyone of them, nor the 'apūrva', but this Akṣara only. One has to imagine the existence of the 'apūrva' as also its power; while what is seen even in ordinary life is that one gets the wages from another whom one serves. Even the gods like Indra keep on waiting to receive the offerings which are given in a sacrifice, and so are seen to be dependent upon those who perform the

sacrifice. Obviously, gods too cannot be said to be the giver of fruits. Naturally, the only choice left for us is to assume the existence of Akṣara who is the absolute controlling power behind all the karmas, the sacrifices, the performers of them and the donors, as well as behind the distribution of the fruits. 9

89. *One who realizes the Brahman is a Brāhmaṇa*

Therefore whatever one may give by way of offerings in the sacred fire, whatever sacrifices he may perform, or whatever penances he may practise for thousands of years, all that will perish if he does not possess the knowledge of this Akṣara. One who dies without realizing it becomes miserable by being born again and again for reaping the perishable fruits of his actions. On the contrary, one who departs from this world after having realized the Akṣara can alone be called a Brāhmaṇa. 10

In order to ward off the view that it might be of the nature of the Pradhāna (Prakṛti) of the Sāṃkhyas, and therefore unconscious though as possessing the power to control, Yājñavalkya proceeds to tell us that the Akṣara is the unseen Seer or the sight itself. 'Likewise, it is the hearer, though itself unheard; being itself the thinker, it can never become the object of the thinking mind; and though it comprehends all, it can never be comprehended by the intellect. To realize that is the highest end of the human life. That is the Parabrahma, the Truth of truths. There is nothing beyond it.' 11

Thereupon, addressing the Brahmins Gārgī declared, 'None of you should ever think of giving a defeat to Yājñavalkya by arguing with him. This is what I had told you even before I had asked him my two questions. You should therefore think yourselves to be most fortunate if you will retire from discussing with him any more after saluting him with reverence. 12

What this Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa has achieved is this. What is known as the Akṣara is the one, non-dual, upādhiless Brahman or the Paramātman. He is known as the Antaryāmin in his capacity of being ever-abiding, infinite, unhindered knowledge; this is his Māyā whom none of the beings ever know. And he is also known as the saṃsārī jiva when he becomes limited as if by avidyā, kāma (desires) and karma. Brahman alone is the

Reality; everything else is appearance due to limitations that are superimposed upon that reality.

(Here ends the eighth Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa of the third Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA THIRD : NINTH BRĀHMAṆA

90 *The maximum and the minimum number of gods*

Finally, there came forward Vidagdha Śākalya who asked 'How many gods are there?' and Yājñavalkya answered: three and three hundred; and as three thousand, as mentioned in the context of Viśvedeva. On being asked again and again by Śākalya, 'How many gods are there?' he answered, 'thirty-three, six, three, two, one and a half, and one.' Yājñavalkya, then explained that the three thousand, three hundred and six gods are the manifestations of thirty-three chief gods, namely, the eight Vasus, eleven Rudras, twelve Ādityas, Indra and Prajāpati. The eight Vasus are fire, earth, Vāyu, heaven, Āditya, celestial ākāśa, the moon and the stars. These are there on account of the karmas, the fruits, the bodies and the senses of the jivas, and it is these which constitute the entire world. The Rudras are the five sense-organs, five organs of action, and the mind as the eleventh; while they depart from the body, they make the jiva cry with misery; and so they are known as Rudras (from 'rud' to weep). The twelve months of the year which come again and again and exhaust the life-span and the fruits of the actions of the jivas, are known as the twelve Ādityas. Indra is the killer of the jivas by the power of his thunderbolt; and the animal that is killed in the sacrifice is the Prajāpati. Omit the moon and the stars, and the remaining six Vasus are then the six gods. The three lokas (worlds) are the three gods. Food and Prāṇa constitute the two gods. Vāyu which causes prosperity is the god which is one and a half; that is, Vāyu is one, but the prosperity to which he leads is half; therefore Vāyu is considered as one and a half divinity, whereas he is only one and identical with the Brahman. It is the Prāṇa who though one, grows up to infinity on account of the differences of nāma,

rūpa, karma, guṇa, and śakti. This means, numerically, in spite of the above-mentioned contraction from many to one, on account of the controlling power due to his immanence there is the infinite expansion of that one God. 1-9

The earth is the body of this God; by means of fire, he is able to see; and whatever he does is by his mind. One who knows him becomes endowed with learning. 'I know him', said Śākalya; 'but if you, O Yājñavalkya, know him, then tell me by what attributes he is qualified.' Yājñavalkya answered that in him the earthly nature comes from the side of the father in the form of bones, marrow and semen, and becomes the receptacle of skin, flesh and blood which come there from the side of the mother, as the result of divinity of the Amṛta, that is, the juice of the food which the mother eats. 10

91. *The divinities as located in the Self of Yājñavalkya*

Next, follow seven more divinities whom, as Yājñavalkya says, he knows, though Śākalya does not believe it. So, on being urged by Śākalya to mention and explain the nature of those divinities, Yājñavalkya does so one by one. (2) There comes in order the divinity of Kāma, the sexual urge, which is incited by lust for women. Therefore this kāma is said to be the body; the heart, that is, the mind and the intellect are the instruments by which the person being excited knows that he is in love (3). Next, comes the Puruṣa in the Sun who manifests all the forms and colours of things, and who is presided over by the divinity of the Eye, inasmuch as the Sun is said to be born out of the Adhyātmika eye. Rūpa, that is the form and colour (complexion) are said to be the body of kāma: the eye is the seer, and the mind contemplates upon it. (4) There are then the other kinds of Puruṣas, one who has ākāśa as the body, ear as the instrument of knowledge, and the mind as light and the quarters as the divinity of it. (5) Another, who has darkness as his body, that is, who is constituted out of ignorance or shadow, who has Death as his divinity, and who is located in the heart and the mind. (6) Another still who has the various forms as his body, the eye as the instrument of knowing him, and the mind as the means of thinking about him. The reflection in the mirror is that Puruṣa; he has Prāṇas as his divinity, that is, he

is produced out of Prāṇa. (7) There is again a Puruṣa whose body is water; the heart is the means of knowing him; and mind thinks about him. Varuṇa is the divinity out of which that Puruṣa is born. (8) And finally, there is the Puruṣa whose body is made up of semen, and the heart and mind are the means of knowledge and thinking respectively. Prajāpati, that is the father, is the divinity; and so the son is that Puruṣa 11-17

After having described all these various Puruṣas, Yājñavalkya said to Śākalya, 'Indeed, these Brahmins are treating you as if you are a pair of tongs by which burning cinders are picked up and thrown out. What he meant was that Śākalya's thoughtlessness was making Yājñavalkya more and more angry and that Śākalya would be burnt thereby. Śākalya however not being able to understand the import of Yājñavalkya's remarks said to him in return, 'You are insulting these Brahmins who have come here from the countries of the Kurus and the Pañcālas, and are thereby pretending that you are the knower of Brahman. I have the knowledge of even the divinities of the various quarters and the supports of them all. If you have realized the Brahman then tell me if you have this knowledge. Yājñavalkya replied that he has realized the Brahman and has therefore become Self of all. And as he had taken his seat facing the east in that assembly, Śākalya asked him again 'If you have become the Ātman of the quarters, tell me what particular deity have you become in the east'. 'I am the Sun,' answered Yājñavalkya. Then corresponding to all other questions of Śākalya, Yājñavalkya answered them as, 'the Sun is located in the eyes, as the Śruti tells us that the Sun is born out of them, and as it is well-known that the effect lives in the cause, the eyes, in their turn, are located in the Rūpa. For, it is the rūpa which has been instrumental in creating the eyes for the purpose of seeing the rūpa itself. Therefore along with the Sun and the eyes, and all the things which are in the direction of the east are located in the Rūpa. And further, the rūpa itself is located in the heart, which means the mind and the buddhi taken together. For, all the forms (rūpas) of things, as also of desired objects are seen, thought of and remembered by the mind and the intellect only. 20

'What deity have you become in the South', asked Śākalya. 'I am Yama who is supported by Yājña, which in its turn, is

rooted in faith, for when it springs forth from the heart, then alone the sacrificer distributes wealth to the priests', answered Yājñavalkya. It is on account of the giving away of wealth in charity that the sacrificer purchases the merit of the sacrifice along the Southern direction and its presiding deity, namely, Yama. In the same way, Yājñavalkya told that he is the divinity of Varuṇa in the west and that Varuṇa is located in water, and that water, in its turn, in the semen, and that it is due to the semen in the heart of the father that the son is born. Śruti says that Varuṇa is born out of Śraddhā (faith), but it tells us again that Śraddhā itself is water. Therefore, it follows that Varuṇa comes out of water. Similarly, it is told that semen is produced out of the heart, because it is in the heart that there arises the sexual desire. (21-22) Yājñavalkya, then told that he was the divinity of Soma in the North, that Soma is supported by the Dikṣā of the sacrificer who buys the soma plant. This again is held up by truth since the sacrificer is instructed by the priest to speak the truth which, in its turn, is the heart of man. For then alone man speaks the truth. (23) And, finally, when asked as to what divinity he was in the direction above (Urdhva) which is also called 'Dhruva' on account of its ever being full of light, Yājñavalkya replied that he was fire. Speech is the receptacle of fire; while ultimately, the heart as before, is the receptacle of speech. Thus, in short, karma, names and forms were shown by Yājñavalkya as being located in his heart.

Yājñavalkya then uttered the word 'Ahallika' which meant 'death', and asked Śākalya if he knew that Aupaniṣadic Puruṣa who, leaving away all the above-mentioned supports, and being bereft of all the attributes and wants like hunger and thirst, lives in his own glory; but that in case he would be unable to explain clearly and unambiguously, his head would fall. As Śākalya had no realization of the Ātman, the Upaniṣad tells us that his head fell down dead on the earth. Not only did he lose his head, the bones of his body also were stolen by thieves, and so no funeral rites were performed. Therefore what the Upaniṣad intends to convey us as the moral of the allegory is that no one should indulge in censuring the realizer of the Brahman. 26

Thinking then that it would not be proper to carry away the cows without the consent of the Brahmins, Yājñavalkya requested them to ask him whatever questions they would like indivi-

dually or collectively, or permit him to ask anyone of them or all of them any questions he would like. But no one of them spoke to him in reply. Yājñavalkya then said to them:

It is seen that a tree which is cut grows again; but who can tell how the jīva comes to life again after the death of the body? What Yājñavalkya intended to know from the Brahmins was the cause by which the world is produced again after it has been dissolved. But no Brahmin could give any answer to his question. Then the Upaniṣad itself says that it is the direct and concrete experience of the blissful Brahman (Vijñānam, Ānandam Brahma), which is neither mixed with the misery due to the experience of the objects of the senses nor with the desires, anger, etc., which arise on account of them. It gives abiding joy and contentment on account of its eternal, homogeneous character. Brahman therefore is the ultimate destination of all those who do the actions, including the giving away of wealth in charity, and of those who have realized it. 28

Now, in the context of the Brahmanānda Śrī Śaṅkarācārya observes after careful consideration of the whole problem, thus. Though the ordinary people mean by ānanda nothing but the sensuous pleasure, what this and the other Upaniṣads like the Taittirīya mean is that it is an attribute of Brahman. The problem before us therefore is whether this Brahmanānda can be a matter of experience or not. If it is, then naturally, along with the experience of the Brahman, its attribute of the ānanda will also be necessarily a part of that experience. If it is not, there would be the dualism of Brahman and ānanda, as separated from each other. The evidence of Śruti appears to be on both the sides. On the one hand, ānanda is said to be the core of the experience of Brahman; on the other, we are told that if there be the experience of unity who should know whom? The Sāṃkhya and the Vaiśeṣikas deny that there is the experience of ānanda during the condition of liberation; whereas there are the Vedāntins who say that the realization of Brahman yields unlimited bliss.

First, then, is mentioned the Pūrvapakṣa, namely, that even during liberation bliss is experienced as belonging to it. This means that there is the consciousness of liberation as well as that of bliss. But this involves the tacit assumption of a subject and an object as well as of some action and its means, which are

impossible to be there in view of the Advaitic Śruti passages. The Pūrvapakṣin, however, contends that notwithstanding the impossibility of there being any action, it is a fact that the knower of the Ātman knows also that he is blissful. This means that the ānanda in the Brahman is an object of experience.

As against this the Upaniṣadic Siddhānta (conclusion) is this. There can be no separate consciousness of ānanda during the condition of liberation on account of the fact that there takes place complete oblivion of the presence of the body and senses. And if the ānanda were to be considered as an object different from the realization of the Brahman, there would then be no non-dual Reality. It is impossible to conceive that the blissful Brahman which is one and non-dual will be conscious that its bliss is separate from it. It is also impossible to conceive that the jīva who is immersed in saṁsāra will ever know the Brahman; much less will he be able to say whether the ānanda of Brahman is or is not separate from the Brahman. But even when he becomes free from saṁsāra, that is when he would become one with Brahman, it will not be possible for him to say, as said above, regarding the blissful Brahman that the ānanda is or can be known separately from the realization of Brahman. The realizer of Brahman cannot have any separate existence apart from the Brahman, just as a piece of salt cannot have it if it is put in water. Therefore, he too will not experience the ānanda of Brahman as separate from the realization of Brahman. To say that the realizer is separate from Brahman is to go against the great statement, '*Tat* (Brahman) *Tvam* (thou, i.e., the individual soul) *asi* (is identical);' and to say that he is both separate and not separate is meaningless.

What then is the meaning of the verb 'knows' in 'he knows the Brahman'? That word has got the meaning which it ordinarily conveys only when a certain person becomes aware of something by means of his senses, mind and intellect. But as Brahman means the knowledge or the realization itself, and as there is no tinge of ignorance in it, the word 'knows' is thoroughly meaningless when it is applied to Brahman. To say that the Ātman or Brahman is sometimes knowledge and blissful and sometimes not is to make it non-eternal, changeable and *jāda*. Therefore the Śruti passages which make mention of the sport, the eating, etc., of the Ātman refer only to the pleasure

and pain which are superimposed on the Brahman on account of the possession of the body, the senses, etc., by the realizer of the Brahman. Actions like eating, sporting, etc., are after all unreal, though they are mentioned as a praise of the realized person. But nowhere has misery been mentioned, for that would have been derogatory of the Brahma-jñānin.

In short, as ānanda cannot be said to be a separate object which has to be experienced apart from the knowledge of the Brahman, the conclusion is that Brahman is one, homogeneous, unlimited, blissful consciousness or Caitanya.

(Here ends the ninth Brāhmaṇa of the third Adhyāya as also the Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FOURTH : BRĀHMAṆA FIRST

The third adhyāya was devoted to the consideration of how the eight kinds of embodied Puruṣas are thought to be located in the heart; how, in the same manner, the five quarters were also shown to have been located in the heart; how the heart and the body have been shown to resolve into the fivefold Prāṇa which is the unmanifest cause of the world (Sūtra), how the Aupaniṣadic Puruṣa who has gone beyond all the qualities is describable only in negative terms such as, 'not this, not this'; and how, finally, the same Puruṣa or Brahman is at once both Vijñāna and Ānanda. Now, the first two Brāhmaṇas of this fourth adhyāya will be devoted to the consideration of how the realization of the same Brahman can be achieved by some other means such as looking upon the divinities of fire etc., out of which speech, etc., have their origin as the forms of Brahman only. The allegory introduced here is meant for telling us that one who wishes to obtain the Brahmanvidyā should acquire it by putting his faith in the spiritual teacher.

Janaka, the King of Videha, had taken his royal seat in order to be able to give audience to those who wished to meet him. At that time, the sage Yājñavalkya also went there. The King received him with great respect and inquired as to why he had come. 'Is it with the intention of obtaining cows from me, or with the intention of giving me an opportunity to put forth

certain important questions regarding the knowledge of the Brahman', asked the King. 'With both the intentions, O Sovereign of the country', replied Yājñavalkya. 1

92. *Vāk Prāṇa, Eye, Ear, Mind and the Heart can be worshipped as merely the aspects of Brahman*

Yājñavalkya proceeded to inquire of the King if any preceptor had told him about the nature of Brahman, and that, if so, he wished to hear about the same. Whereupon the King told him about what Śailini, the son of Śilina, had, said namely, 'Vāk' (speech) meaning thereby the divinity of Fire, is the Brahman. 'Yes, this is exactly what a good and kind mother or father, or a preceptor should tell. But what is the use of this to a dumb person? Well, did Śailini tell you about the body and the support of Vāk? Otherwise what he told constitutes only a fourth of the knowledge of Brahman.' The King replied, 'No, he did not. But let me then, Yājñavalkya, hear it from you.' Whereupon Yājñavalkya said, 'One should worship the Vāk, thinking that it is its own body (source) and knowledge, and that ākāśa is its support. Vāk is the instrument of knowledge; due to it one can know who are his friends and relatives; due to it one can have the knowledge of the four Vedas, of history and Purāṇas, of the Upaniṣads and the Sūtras like Brahma-sūtras, of various sacrifices and rituals, and of this and other worlds and beings, O King. One who worships the Vāk as the Parabrahma is favoured and protected by all the beings. He becomes God-like here on earth, and becomes one with God after death.' Being pleased with this, Janaka said, 'I shall present you a thousand bulls and one hundred thousand cows for having imparted this knowledge to me.' 'No', said Yājñavalkya 'my father used to say that one should not accept wealth from his disciple unless he is thoroughly satisfied by the knowledge imparted by his Guru. And I also am of the same opinion.' 2

Janaka then narrated how Udanka, son of Śulba, told him that Prāṇa is the Brahman. As before Yājñavalkya said that Udanka had told the King only a part of the Brahmanvidyā, though he had told it as a kind mother and father, or a preceptor might tell him. But that is of no use to one whose Prāṇas have ceased to function, and inquired if Udanka had told the

King anything about the body and the support of Prāṇa. On knowing that Udanka was silent on that point, Yājñavalkya said that 'Prāṇa, meaning thereby the divinity of Vāyu (wind), is the body of the prāṇas (sense-organs) and that ākāśa is the support of it. One should therefore worship the prāṇa as being his dearest object. For, it is for the protection and the well-being of the prāṇas (the senses) that even a fallen man gets many sacrifices performed by persons who do not deserve to be priests, and who accept gifts in charity from worthless persons. Hence, O King, Prāṇa is the Parabrahma. One who thinks so is not forsaken by the prāṇas. All the beings favour and protect him. And, one who worships Prāṇa in this manner becomes God-like here on earth, and becomes one with God after death. Being pleased with this, Janaka said, 'I shall present you one thousand bulls and one hundred thousand cows for having imparted me this knowledge.' 'No', said Yājñavalkya, 'My father used to say none should accept wealth from his disciple, unless he is thoroughly satisfied with the knowledge imparted by his Guru. And I also am of the same opinion.' 3

Again did Janaka narrate to Yājñavalkya what Barku, the son of Vṛṣṇu had told him, namely, that the eye is the Brahman. As before, Yājñavalkya said that 'it constituted only a part of Brahman, though it was told as a kind mother, father or a preceptor might tell. But of what use could it be to one who is blind?' And when he came to know that Barku had not told the King anything more, Yājñavalkya said that 'the eye itself is the body of the eye and ākāśa is the support of it. One should worship the eye as truth; for what is seen by the eye is believed as true, and what is heard by the ear is considered as false. One who believes that the eye is the Parabrahma is never forsaken. All the beings favour and protect him. He lives God-like on this earth, and becomes one with God after death.' Again did Janaka say with pleasure that he would like to present Yājñavalkya with a thousand bulls and one hundred thousand cows. Yājñavalkya also replied as before that like his father he too did not wish to accept any wealth from his disciple, unless the latter was thoroughly satisfied. 4

'That the ear is the Brahman was told to me by Gardhabhivṛṣṇa of Bhāradvāja Gotra,' said Janaka again. 'Yes, he told you what could have been told by a kind mother, father or a pre-

ceptor. But, after all that is only about an aspect of Brahman. And how will it be useful to one who is deaf? Let me tell you that the ear is its own body and ākāśa is its support. One should worship it as "infinite"; for the quarters being endless, one can never be able to go to the whole length of anyone of them. The quarters themselves constitute the ear. Knowing so, one who worships the ear as Brahman never becomes deaf. All the beings favour and protect him. He becomes God-like on this very earth and one with God after death.' As before, being pleased, Janaka said he would present him for imparting that knowledge a thousand bulls and one hundred thousand cows; but Yājñavalkya also, as before, refused to accept because he, like his father, was of the opinion that he should not accept any gift till his disciple was perfectly satisfied. 5

Janaka then narrated how Jābāla Satyakāma had told him that mind is the Brahman. 'Yes, that was like how a kind mother, father or a preceptor would tell. But it is only an aspect of Brahman; and it will not be of any use to one whose mind remains vacant. One who worships, however, the mind as Brahman, thinking that it is its own body and the ākāśa as its support will be full of ānanda (bliss). The moon is the divinity of the mind. Knowing this, one who worships the mind as Brahman will be favoured and protected by all the beings. He will be God-like here on earth, and be one with God after death. And, because the mind is the source of ānanda, man longs for a woman, and living with her he produces progeny, which also becomes a source of joy to him'. As before, the king offered the present of the bulls and the cows numbering a thousand and one hundred thousand respectively, but Yājñavalkya said that like his father he also did not wish to accept any gift till the disciple was not perfectly satisfied. 6

And, finally, Janaka told Yājñavalkya that one Vidagdha Śākalya had told him that the heart is the Brahman. 'This also is only a portion of Brahman, but what would be its use to one who is heartless?' said Yājñavalkya. He then told the king that 'the heart is the receptacle and the support of all beings, and of all things which have names and forms, as also of all actions. The heart is the Parabrahman. Therefore one who worships the heart as the cause of all existence is favoured and protected by all beings. He becomes God-like here on earth

and one with God after death; Prajāpati is the divinity who resides in the heart.' As before, the king being pleased, offered Yājñavalkya the present of a thousand bulls and one hundred thousand cows, but the sage refused to accept because he, like his father, believed that no present should be accepted till the disciple was not perfectly satisfied. 7

(Here ends the first Brāhmaṇa of the fourth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FOURTH : BRĀHMAṆA SECOND

93. *Leaving his pride as a king, Janaka approaches Yājñavalkya with the humility of a disciple*

The first Brāhmaṇa was devoted to the description of certain upāsanās which were thought to be the means of knowing the Brahman. Now, begins this second Brāhmaṇa with the view to enabling one to know the same Brahman by reference to the states, namely, the waking, the sleeping and the dreaming. Janaka appeared to be puffed with pride when Yājñavalkya went to meet him. He must have thought of himself as a jñānin who could ask subtle and difficult questions to Yājñavalkya on matters spiritual, inasmuch as with the consciousness of his kingly position he inquired of him whether he had come to listen to his questions or to obtain some cows from him. But when he was convinced that Yājñavalkya was possessed of the various kinds of knowledge regarding the different aspects of qualified Brahman, his pride left him altogether; and then getting up from his special royal seat, he approached Yājñavalkya with humility and prostrating at his feet implored him to instruct him into the lore of the Brahman.

94. *The Ātman as Vaiśvānara, Taijasa and Prājña*

Yājñavalkya then praised the king by saying, 'You are, O King both learned and devoted, as well as most powerful and wealthy. Not only have you studied the Vedas, but you are also well versed in the knowledge of the several upāsanās which your

preceptors have imparted unto you; but without the knowledge of the Ātman, all that will be of no use. You are endowed with every kind of glory and prosperity; yet, as fear has not left you, with all your upāsanaṁ which will serve you as chariots or boats, you do not know the destination to which you shall go after your death. But, now that you have approached me as my disciple, I shall tell you everything about it.' So saying, Yājñavalkya continued, 'This Puruṣa in the right eye, about whom Barku had told you, is known as Satya or as Indha on account of his resplendent beauty. Gods who take pleasure in referring to him only in an indirect manner call him as Indra. By knowing him you will be knowing the Ātman known as Vaiśvānara of the waking condition.' 2

The Upaniṣad probably believes that for the completion of the upāsana of the Vaiśvānara what is necessary, is both the Indra and his consort, Indrāṇi. Yājñavalkya therefore said that 'the Puruṣa in the left eye is the Indrāṇi. The enjoyment of them both is the Taijasa Ātman, or the consciousness in dream. The ākāśa in the fleshy portion of the heart is the chamber where they meet. The red lump of the flesh in the heart is their food. Now, the food which one eats gets itself transformed in two ways. The gross portion of it descends downwards, while the subtle portion is cooked again by the internal fire. The subtle juice of it is transformed into blood and other ingredients cause the growth of the physical body. The subtlest portion is transformed into the red lump of flesh and blood of the subtle body (linga-deha) of Indra. This, in its turn, enters into the subtlest nāḍis (veins) and nourish both the Indra and the Indrāṇi. These innumerable nāḍis with innumerable holes in them, constitute as if a garment with which both of them cover their bodies when they sleep. When that couple wakes up from the dreaming consciousness, it travels by the Hitā nāḍis which go out from the heart to all the parts of the body and carry with them the subtle food for its nourishment and growth. In short, it is the Taijasa Ātman who is subtler than the Vaiśvānara.' 3

Thus, one who goes beyond the consciousness that he is the Vaiśvānara Ātman of the waking life and realizes that he is the Taijasa Ātman of the dream in the heart, and then one who goes beyond from that to the Prājña Ātman, who usually remains unknown during sleep, will also realize that there is the fourth

state of Brahmanic consciousness in which all the directions, namely, the east, the west, the south, and the north as well as the upward and downward directions become his prāṇas. He becomes, in other words, the all-pervading Prāṇa or the Ātman. Naturally, he too like the Ātman becomes incapable of being described except in negative terms, namely, 'not this, not this.' He can neither be grasped by the senses or the intellect, nor is he destroyed, contaminated, bound or afflicted. 'Indeed, O Janaka, by realizing this Ātman,' said Yājñavalkya, 'you will be going beyond the fear of death.' At this, Janaka came to know that to give cows and bulls in exchange could never be the price of the Ātmavidyā given by Yājñavalkya, and so he said to him, 'I have nothing which I can give you in exchange. You can have me as your servant and the kingdom of Videha for yourself. I only salute you and wish you also to be ever fearless.' 4

(Here ends the second Brāhmaṇa of the fourth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FOURTH : BRĀHMANA THIRD

Before proceeding further let us take stock of what has been told in the first three adhyāyas. In the first adhyāya the Brahman was described as the Vijñānamaya Ātman because he is viewed as the immanent Being in all and as the only witness of all. In the Madhu-kāṇḍa of the second adhyāya, during the course of the conversation between Ajātaśatru and Gārgya it was shown that the prāṇa, etc., are not the real doers or enjoyers, but that the Vijñānātmā who is different from them all, is alone responsible for the several actions such as seeing, hearing, speaking, etc. Yet, in the third adhyāya, it was shown in the context of the question put forth by Uṣasta Cākṛāyaṇa that the same Vijñānātmā who, in a general way, was previously described as one who functions by the means of prāṇa, etc., is again specifically described as the Seer of the sight, as one whose power of seeing is never lost, and as one who is eternally the Self-conscious knowledge itself. Consistently with this, it was then explained that just as the appearances of a serpent, a mirage and silver are superimposed on the rope, the desert, and

the shell, respectively, even so the whole of the saṁsāra is superimposed on the Ātman on account of the Upādhis of antaḥkaraṇa, etc., due to ignorance. As opposed to this the nirupādika (without any limitations) Ātman was shown to be beyond speech and mind, and as describable by negative terms only, namely, 'not this, not this.' Or, as explained in the Kahola Brāhmaṇa, the Ātman or the Brahman is shown to be, as the innermost Being, as the Akṣara, the controller, the Aupaniṣadic Puruṣa, and as 'Vijñānam Ānandam Brahma'.

So far with the retrospective view of the first three adhyāyas of this Upaniṣad. What has been achieved in the first two Brāhmaṇas of this fourth adhyāya is this: In the first Brāhmaṇa, six specific means of the realization of some of the aspects of Brahman have been recommended by six different preceptors. In the second, known as the Kūrca Brāhmaṇa, the three states of wakefulness, dream and sleep, have been mentioned in order to show the gradual transformation of the Vaiśvānara Ātman into the Taijasa, and of the Taijasa Ātman into the Prājña, and of Prājña again into the Turiya (the fourth) state of Brahmanic consciousness. The purpose of that Brāhmaṇa was, in other words, to show the nature of 'krama-mukṭi', that is, liberation by gradual stages. And, now, in this third Brāhmaṇa what is going to be discussed is the same topic of the four states with greater and detailed application of reasoning and inference, with the view to making known very clearly the nature of Brahman. No doubt, one should be fearless as was told by Yājñavalkya at the end of the second Brāhmaṇa, but at the same time one must realize that this would only be possible by the knowledge of the Ātman. This is necessary because there are some who do not believe in the Vedas; while others who believe in the existence of the Ātman think that he is not different from the body, senses, etc. But it is essential not only to know that the Ātman is altogether different from the body-complex, but also that he is not the doer or the enjoyer of fruits, that he is not inconscient but self-effulgent, that his purity, power and self-consciousness can never be eclipsed, and that though formless and without any attribute, he is at once Vijñāna and Ānanda. In short, the aim of this Brāhmaṇa is to instruct us that the Ātman is one, non-dual and as not having phenomenal existence only. The allegory which is introduced is for the pur-

pose of showing that the Brahma-vidyā has to be imparted by one who has realized it to one who has not, that is by the Spiritual Teacher (Guru) to his disciples. It will also show by means of praise the incomparable worth of that Vidyā, as will be proved by the question which the King Janaka had asked at the very beginning of the allegory.

The sage, Yājñavalkya once went to the court of the King Janaka. On his way, he thought that he should not of his own accord tell anything to the king regarding spiritual knowledge; his intention in seeing the king was perhaps to receive from him wealth and cows. But, as on an earlier occasion, being very much pleased with Janaka's knowledge regarding agnihotra, Yājñavalkya had given him a boon whereby Janaka could ask any question he liked. And, on the strength of it, as Janaka asked him a question regarding the Brahma-vidyā, Yājñavalkya had to answer it much against his will. Janaka chose this opportunity because he could not have asked the question regarding Brahma-vidyā, when on the earlier occasion, the discussion was with reference to the topics in the Karma-kāṇḍa only. This itself is sufficient to show that there is nothing common between the two kinds of knowledge, and that the Brahma-vidyā by itself and independently of the knowledge of Karma-kāṇḍa is capable of making one attain the highest end of human life, namely, the realization of the Brahman. 1

95. *The Ātman is the Light of all other lights*

'What is that light, whether it is external to the body and the senses, etc. or internal, O Yājñavalkya, that enables a man to do his various activities, such as sitting, going, coming, etc.?' asked Janaka, who though very intelligent was not able to decide one way or the other. Yājñavalkya replied that 'inasmuch as the eye cannot see anything without the light of the Sun, we must conclude that it is the light of the Sun, which causes all the activities of man.' On being asked as to what that light is after the sun sets, Yājñavalkya said it is the moon. Similarly, he said that after the setting of the moon, fire is the light, and that when the fire also is extinguished it is the light of the word which by its sound incites the ear and thereby creates thoughts in the mind regarding the meaning of what is heard,

so that we can say that man sees by his mind and hears by his ears. For instance, when none of the external lights is there, when there is pitchy darkness produced by the dark clouds of the rainy season, when one may not be able to see his own hand clearly, the sound alone, whether it is of the barking of a dog or of the braying of an ass, brings the ears in contact with the mind, and enables the man to act as it suits his purpose. Indeed, what is said about the light of the word applies also to smell, touch, etc. 2-5

‘When, however, there is the absence of sound or smell, etc., over and above the absence of the Sun, the moon, the fire, the light by which man is prompted to do some or other activity is the Ātman, O King,’ said Yājñavalkya. This means that just as even during the waking life the activities of the body and the senses occur on account of the light of the Sun who is beyond them all, even so during dream and sleep when all the above-mentioned lights are not available, the light which is responsible for causing the activities of experiencing the dreams and the happiness of having a sound sleep, must be coming from one who is beyond all those lights. Nay, even experience of the visions of the deities whom people worship during meditation are caused by that light. This is the light of the Ātman. The Sun and the other lights, though they are different from and beyond the body-complex, are perceivable by the senses. But the Ātman, who is beyond the body, and the senses is not seen by them, though he also is the cause of certain activities when none of the other lights is available. Therefore it follows that the Ātman is not only beyond and different from all the lights and the senses, but is also the internal, non-physical light.

96. *Materialists and Naturalists argue that the Ātma-jyoti is physical in nature*

Here come forward the Lokāyatas who say that what is known as the Ātman is nothing else but the body. Their arguments can be stated thus : (1) The Ātman cannot be non-physical in nature; for, just as the Sun and the other lights by which the body and the senses are made active, are seen to be physical in nature, even so the Ātman, though he is beyond the senses and different from the other lights, must be of the same physical

nature. (2) It is also not correct to say like the Vedāntin that because the Ātma-jyoti (light) is internal and non-sensuous, it is different in nature from the Sun-light etc. For, even the lights of the eye, the ear, etc., are internal and invisible; but this does not make them, or the objects like the Sun, the moon, etc., which are perceivable by them, non physical in nature. Therefore to say that the Ātmajyoti is internal and invisible by the senses is not sufficient to say that it is non-physical in nature. (3) Besides, what is known as consciousness or Caitanya is only an attribute of the body; for, it is present when the body is there and not otherwise. To say that the Ātman gives its light to the body is not sufficient to say that he is different from the body, since even the eye which gives its light to the body is known to be only a part of the body. The extension of the characteristics of one thing to another by way of inference which the Vedāntin does on the basis of what is commonly observed or on the strength of similarity has no logical validity. For, what is directly perceived can never be sublated by inference. The senses have the direct knowledge due to seeing, hearing, thinking, etc. What is then left to be done by the independent Caitanya to do? And even assuming for the time being that the Caitanya is different from the body, the light that moves the body and the senses need not necessarily be that of the Ātman. It can be of an entity like the sun, different in nature from the Ātman.

At this, one might ask as to why it is that his capacity to see, hear, etc. is sometimes manifest and sometimes not. The Svabhāva-vādi (the believer in the uniformity of Nature) might intervene and say that it is on account of the innate nature of the body itself. There cannot be any external reason why the glow-worm sometimes shines and sometimes not. To search out the cause by way of inference from superficial similarity is to become prepared to believe in any absurd conclusion. One might conclude that water like fire is not cold by nature, because both water and fire are substances.

97. *The Vedāntin view that the Ātma-jyoti is both internal and non-sensuous*

To all this the Siddhāntin replies. If the body alone is responsible for the various activities of seeing, hearing, etc., then it can also

have the dreams of several other things which are not the reproductions of things experienced in the waking life. But what happens actually in the dream is that there is neither the awareness of the body nor the activity of the senses. Even a man who has lost his sight will see in his dream such things as he had seen while his sight was not damaged, and not things which he had not seen. This is not possible for the body to do. Even in the case of a person who is born blind, what he sees in a dream must be the result of what he had seen in his previous births. This applies even to memory. The man who recalls is the man who has experienced the things to be recalled. So, even with his eyes closed, he feels he is seeing things very clearly. This means that it is not the closed eyes which are the seer, but the Caitanya which sees the memory-image is the seer; and so, it follows that the same Caitanya must have previously seen the original of that memory-image with eyes open. In no case can it be said that the closed or the open eyes are the seer; much less the body which is bereft of the eyesight. The Caitanya which is both the seer and the recaller must be one and the same, as well as different and independent of the body which does not even move a little when it becomes dead. Nor can it be said that the senses of eye, ear, etc., are the seer; for it is a common experience that one touches something which he wishes to touch only after he sees it first, meaning thereby that the man who sees is not different from the man who touches. It will be absurd to suggest that one person sees and wishes to touch a thing, and another touches it without seeing. Even so, the mind which becomes the object of thought cannot be the seer. Hence, we can say that the light of the Ātman is internal and independent of the body, senses and the mind.

Similarly, what the objector has said that the Ātmajyoti, though internal, must be of the same nature as that of the aggregate of body, senses, etc., which it illumines and manifests, is not correct. For it is not a rule that both must be of the same nature. There may be different kinds of fuel which can kindle the fire into flames; but does it follow from this that all of them are of one kind only? Even water acts as fuel for the fire in the lightning, as also for the fire (Vaiśvānara) in the stomach. No doubt, a man is obliged by man; but sometimes he might be favoured by animals, fire is extinguished by water or by dust.

Hence, we cannot say that because the body and the senses which are moved into activity by the Sun, the moon, etc., and because the lights of the Sun and the moon are physical in nature, therefore the Ātma-jyoti also must be of the same kind. Whereas the Sun and the moon though they are different from the eye become themselves the objects of sensuous perception, the Ātma-jyoti, though equally different from the senses, is never perceived by them. This is the difference between the internal Ātma-jyoti, on the one hand, and the external light of the Sun, the moon, etc., though all of them might be connected with the senses.

As for the argument that Caitanya is present only when the body is present, we have only to show that when a man dies, the body remains but the Caitanya does not. It can remain with or without the body. Similarly, if what is commonly observed will never serve as the basis for inference, all our practical life will come to a standstill. If one kind of food and drink is found to quench our hunger and thirst, it does become the ground for inferring that another kind of food and drink must also have a similar effect. Similarly, again, the example of the glow-worm's light given as an illustration to show that the body may sometimes manifest light and sometimes not, is not adequate. There is the necessity of going beyond what strikes the eye. It is on account of the wings of the glow-worm which cover the light that the light is sometimes visible and sometimes not. Hence, the only conclusion we reach is that the Ātman is both internal and non-sensuous in character. 6

Being possibly bewildered by the doubt that the Ātma-jyoti might be of the same kind as that of the Sun, the moon, etc., Janaka again asks the same question, 'What is that Ātman?' Or it might be that Janaka was unable to have the direct experience of the Ātman as being different from the senses, inasmuch as being pervaded by the light of Vijñāna they all seemed to him to be the same as the Ātman. And so, he wished to know which of them is the real Ātman, just as one might wish to know who among the several Brahmins who look lustrous is the most learned.

98. *Vijñānamaya Ātman is different from both buddhi and jīva*

Yājñavalkya replied that he is the Vijñānamaya Ātman, that is

the Ātman with whose light the Vijñāna or the buddhi comes in contact and thereby becomes able to manifest all the objects perceivable by the senses and the mind. Bhartṛprapañca understands by Vijñānamaya as the jiva who is only a modification (vikāra) of the Vijñāna which means for him the Parabrahma. But while commenting on the word 'Vijñānamaya' in the Taittiriya Upaniṣad, Bhartṛprapañca himself has said that the termination 'Maya' in that word does not indicate any vikāra of Vijñāna, but, that it means buddhi only. Thus not only does he give the word contradictory meanings, but by interpreting the termination 'Maya' as indicating 'vikāra' he makes liberation also as impossible to be attained. That is why Yājñavalkya further says that the Ātman resides in the heart, and yet he is different from the buddhi which resides in the heart as also from the various modifications of the buddhi and the prāṇas, just as a tree standing amidst stones is quite different from the stones.

99. *A series of illusions due to the ignorance of the light of the Ātman*

It is due to the light of that Ātman that the human activities take place; and then, the whole body complex appears to be conscient. Just as when an emerald is placed in milk for testing its colour and light, the milk appears to be coloured, or just as a jar which has no capacity to manifest itself becomes manifest by the light of the Sun, even so the light of the Ātman which resides in the buddhi, being far subtler than the latter, throws its mantle of power on the body and the senses and makes them appear as if they are endowed with consciousness. Being nearest to the Ātman and crystal-like, buddhi becomes immediately affected by the Caitanya of the Ātman, and bewilders even the wise by creating in them the wrong notion that buddhi itself is the Ātman. Similarly, the mind being nearest to buddhi, and being therefore in contact with it, also creates the second wrong notion that the mind is endowed with Caitanya. After this, there occur in succession other false notions that the senses which are in contact with the mind, and the body to which the senses belong are conscious by themselves. Naturally, people begin to believe falsely and say according to their inclination that buddhi is the Ātman, or that the body or the senses are the Ātman.

That the Ātma-jyoti gives its light to all is supported by scriptures also. The Bhagavadgītā says 'just as the one Sun shines over all the worlds, even so, does this Ātman (Kṣetrajña) shine in the body' (13.33); the Kathopanishad says, 'this is the imperishable Ātman, the Caitanya, in all the perishable things;' 'it is by the light of the Ātman that the Sun, the moon, etc. shine' (2.2.14,16). In short, being all-pervading, self-effulgent and bereft of any imperfection Ātman alone is the Puruṣa or the perfect Being. He is the ever-shining Being, whether the whole world exists or not. Being, however, imperceptible by the external and the internal organs of sense and by buddhi, the Ātma-jyoti cannot be taken out and exhibited in the wakeful condition as if it is a blade of grass which can be taken out from its outer sheath. But, as said above, being nearest to buddhi, it first appears to have become of the nature of the buddhi, and so creates the false impression that buddhi is the Ātman. Just as the light of the Sun which falls on objects of different colours appears as if it is itself of different colours, even so the extremely pure light of the Ātman appears to assume the form and nature of buddhi which shines by his light, and then being further, distorted by buddhi, becomes further differentiated as the body, the senses as well as the various objects of the perceptible world. And then, when it becomes impossible for the human reason, on account of this apparent similarity, to distinguish between the Ātman and the buddhi, there occur the mutual superimpositions of the names and forms of the phenomenal world upon the Ātman, and of the Ātman and its attributes on buddhi, senses and the rest of the phenomenal world. People become naturally bewildered by these false superimpositions and then say as they like. For instance, they would falsely say that the Ātman is the doer, or say correctly that he is the non-doer, pure, uncontaminated and so on.

100. *The Ātman does not migrate*

That the Ātman assumes the nature of buddhi is itself the cause of the wrong belief that he remains continuously transmigrating from one body to another, and as moving from the waking to the dreaming and sleeping states. In fact, the Ātman neither

migrates nor moves. That is why when the buddhi meditates, the Ātman appears to be meditating, and the people wrongly say that the Ātman meditates. Similarly, when the organs of sense and action do their respective functions under the influence of the Ātman, it is wrongly said that the Ātman does this all. Similarly, again, when, during sleep, the buddhi undergoes the experience of dream, on account of the light of the Ātman, it is wrongly supposed that he travels to and fro from wakefulness to dream and from dream to wakefulness. In fact, the Ātman is ever beyond the province of death, namely, karma, avidyā, body and its senses.

101. *Objections of the Buddhist Schools*

At this, the Bauddha comes forward with the objection that there cannot be any light of the Ātman over and above the light of the buddhi itself. For, there is neither the perception of the Ātman, nor any sufficient reason whereby one can infer about it. On the contrary, it is the buddhi which throws its light both ways, on the Ātman as well as on the objects, and assumes the forms of the objects which are external to it. This is the position taken by the Sautrāntika and the Vaibhāṣika schools of Buddhism. The Vijñānavādin goes a step further, and says that the jar and the light that manifests it are not, in the first place, perceived as different from each other. What is known by the buddhi is the jar and the light taken together. And, second, he denies not only the externality of the jar but the continuous existence of the same jar. The jar which is thought to be the same is in fact altogether a different jar in every moment. This momentary character of the jar as well as the denial of it as an independent thing external to the light of the buddhi reduces it to an idea in the buddhi or Vijñāna. Thus, what the Vijñānavādin achieves is the denial of the very illustration of the jar and the light, which the Vedāntin uses to show that the Ātma-jyoti is different from the buddhi. For the Vijñānavādin, the jar and the light together become one momentary knowledge or Vijñāna. The Sūnyavādi Buddhist takes up this thread and goes again a step beyond this, and says that inasmuch as the Vijñāna itself is covered by avidyā, it has no real existence. For him, there is complete void, neither the external objects like the jar, nor even the

momentary and the internal Vijñāna. All these schools, however, agree on one point, namely, that they are all against viewing the light of the Ātman as necessary to manifest the Vijñāna or the buddhi.

102. *Refutation of the objections*

To refute the arguments of them all one by one, the Vedāntin first meets the Buddhist who believes that objects have an existence of their own, apart and external to buddhi, and says that the jar by itself has no capacity to manifest. Otherwise, a jar kept in darkness could have been seen without the bringing of the light. This means that which is manifested is different from that which manifests it. Therefore buddhi also can be said to shine by the light of the Ātman. It is true that the jar is seen along with the light which manifests it, because it comes in contact with it, but this does not mean that the two are one and the same. The Vedāntin thus saves his position by pointing out that the illustration which he had used, namely, of the jar and the light which are different from each other, for showing that the Ātma-jyoti is different from buddhi, has got an objective reality.

The objector might turn to another example and say that a lamp does not require another lamp to manifest its existence. But the lamp too like the jar becomes manifest by the light of the Caitanya, says the Vedāntin. Therefore, there is nothing to prevent the buddhi also to be manifested by the light of the Ātman. True, in a way, that without taking into consideration the light of the Caitanya which makes the lamp to shine, the lamp can be said to manifest itself as well as the jar. But the jar becomes manifest only when the lamp is near it, and not otherwise. This shows that the jar is the object to be manifested, and the lamp is what causes manifestation. Even so, the lamp of Vijñāna is the object to be manifested by the Caitanya; though like the lamp, the Vijñāna may have the capacity to manifest other objects. But it can never be said that the Caitanya or the Ātma-jyoti shines by something else; for, that is the eternal, unmodifiable, internal, consciousness or the witness of all. So, there can be no *regress ad infinitum* with reference to the Ātma-jyoti, who is the ultimate manifestor

of all. Neither can there be any regress with reference to the sense-organs which are required to become aware of the objects which are manifested, whether by the light of the lamp or that of the buddhi. For instance, the eye which sees (manifests) both the jar and the light or the lamp does not require any other sense-organ for enabling it to see.

Again the argument of the Vijñānavādin, that just as objects in a dream are not different from the consciousness or the Vijñāna in the dream, even so the objects in the waking life have no real external existence beyond the Vijñāna in the waking life, is faulty in the sense that the Vijñānavādin is not faithful to what he professes. For, by saying 'Vijñāna is the jar, Vijñāna is the lamp', he uses, for the time being at least, words which have specific meanings and which point out different objects as falling outside the scope of the Vijñāna. Or, else, the words which he uses, such as a jar, a piece of cloth, Vijñāna, etc. would be only synonyms of each other. And, if there be no distinction of meaning between ends and means, then there would be no possibility of any instruction to be given regarding what is to be achieved and what is not. There would be no distinction between Pūrvapakṣa and Uttarapakṣa, between merits and demerits and so on. There would then be no discussion and no search for truth. How can there be the non-existence of a jar, etc., if there is the existence of Vijñāna? But even supposing that this is possible, will not the existence of the Vijñāna be different from the existence or non-existence of the jars, etc.? This means that there is something external to the very existence of the vijñāna; and therefore what is said regarding the Vijñāna in dream is not correct. This is enough to refute the Śūnyavāda of the Mādhyamikas also, for, it is impossible not to believe in both the objects and their knowledge.

103. *Knowledge of the continual existence of a thing is necessary for recognition*

As for the doctrine of momentariness, namely, that things exist only for a moment and not beyond, one has only to note how wholly false it is since a jar which is seen in one moment is recognized as the same jar in the next moment also. This cannot

be explained by saying that recognition takes place on account of the similarity between two or more jars which are seen in different moments, since there cannot be any similarity unless there is some sort of identity between the jars. The hair and nails which are removed from the body in one moment of time will no doubt be recognized as hair and nails in any future moment of time. But that will be a judgement regarding the kind or the class of a particular thing. The hair will be called hair and the nails as nails; but to recognize a jar as the same jar which was seen in the previous moment is a judgement not about the kind or class to which a thing belongs, but about a particular individual or group of individual things. To have this kind of recognition, knowledge of mere similarity will not be enough; knowledge of continual existence of a particular thing is essential. And, in addition, what is most essential is that the person who can have recognition of similarity or of identity, must also be presumed to live for at least two moments of time.

Besides, if the present moment and the past moment are absolutely different from each other, the experiences which occupy these two moments are also bound to be different and unconnected with each other, unless they are connected by some third experience. In that case, the third experience at least has to be presumed as having a continual existence for more than one moment. But this is just to oppose the doctrine of momentariness. And, if the two moments and the two experiences occupying the two moments are allowed to fall away from each other, then all practical, daily life, including even reference to oneself as distinct from others, would be impossible.

Further, the fear of the Bauddha that Vijñāna might be contaminated by misery, pain, etc., and therefore his anxiety to keep it pure, has also no real basis. If Vijñāna is known to itself, if its only nature is to shed the light of knowledge, and if beyond it there is no possibility of the existence of any other witness, then to believe that like a pomegranate the Vijñāna also contains several seeds of misery, pain, etc., is to throw overboard the doctrine of the one, universal Vijñāna. How can dirt be a part of Vijñāna, if it does not come in contact with anything else? And, how can there be any talk

about the removal of that dirt? To believe that Vijñāna can become soiled by dirt, and that one can become pure by the removal of it is nothing but blind credulity, without any validity.

And, finally, what is most astounding is that the Buddhists believe that the end of human life is to extinguish the light of that Vijñāna. But who indeed will be there to get the fruit of the Nirvāṇa or of the extinguishing of the light, if the person who desires so is dead and gone? To suggest that the Advaitic Vedāntin also is in the same boat, because he too believes in the uncontaminated and non-dual Brahman, and yet thinks that there can be liberation from the miserable saṁsāra, is not correct. For, though he believes in the Brahman which is one, eternal and pure, he also believes that so far as the ordinary, practical life is concerned, all the distinctions of cause and effects, of actions and their fruits, etc., remain, as they are, inasmuch as they are the effects of avidyā. 7

104. *The real nature of the Ātman can be discovered in the dreaming consciousness*

Now, it is the same Puruṣa who being endowed with body and the senses is said to have come to birth, but who, when he is about to die, that is when he wishes to enter into another body, leaves them away. This means that just as when the Ātman passes from the waking consciousness into the dreaming condition, he leaves away the body and the senses, and resides in his own natural light, even so at the time of death he leaves one body and migrates into another. Thus, what is proved in both the cases is that the Ātman is different from the body and the senses. It is the Ātman's being associated with and dissociated from the body and senses, that are respectively known as the birth and the death of the jīva. In fact, the Ātman is beyond both of them.

Living as if in the intermediate state of the dreaming consciousness, and being identical with buddhi, the Ātman looks upon both the worlds, that is upon the present and the future births, and moves between them by having innumerable miserable rounds of birth and death. He looks, in other words upon pleasures and pains which he had experienced as the

result of his desires in his previous birth, and upon the fruits which he might get in the future following the path of righteousness or by means of propitiating the deities. The dream is no doubt generally a reproduction of what is previously experienced. But it need not necessarily be of what is experienced in the waking condition; it may be of what had been experienced in the previous births, and sometimes a forecast of what is going to be experienced in the future, whether in the present life or in the life to come after death.

So, what has been ascertained till now is that, inasmuch as in the waking condition there being no possibility of the Ātman being shown as bereft of the body and the senses, as also of his having self-effulgent light always, it is open to people to disbelieve in the existence of the Ātman. Therefore, it was with the view to pointing out the real nature of the Ātman that Yājñavalkya had begun to describe the condition of the dreaming consciousness, as a step towards understanding the sleeping condition. Though there is neither body nor senses in a dream, what the Ātman does is that he creates prototypes of them out of the desires of man, and there he sleeps, shedding his light upon the desires and turning them as if into concrete objects. So, what is not possible to be shown in the waking life or in deep sleep is possible only in the dreaming state. In the waking condition the Ātman appears to be so much mixed up and contaminated with the various objects that it becomes impossible to make him distinct and to show clearly what his real nature is. In sleep, there being no concrete objects it is equally impossible to have the distinct and clear knowledge about him. So, in both the conditions, the existence and the nature of the Ātman becomes a matter of arbitrary opinion. That he is the self-effulgent creator, and has the power to migrate from one condition or one birth to another, and that he can look beyond the present time to both the past and the future, is only proved by means of the dreaming consciousness. 9

It might be contended that there is no fundamental difference between wakefulness and dream, for, in both of them the ordinary practical life runs its course in almost the same manner. There is even the perceptual knowledge, as if, of the Sun, the moon and the stars. But this is only a superficial resemblance. The dream is totally different from the wakeful condition.

Whereas in the condition of wakefulness, the Ātma-jyoti is mixed up with the senses, the mind and the intellect, in a dream, there is the absence of the senses as well as of the light of the Sun, the moon, etc ; and so the Ātma-jyoti stands apart from them all. The mind, however, which is not absent and which does not cease to act like the senses, assumes the forms of the various objects, and hence does not become an obstruction to the self-effulgent light of the Ātman. There are no chariots, no horses or no roads in a dream; but the Ātman produces them according to the desires of the mind and the karma of the man. All this is seen by the light of the Ātman just as a sword drawn out of its sheath is seen shining by its own lustre. Just as there are no chariots or no lakes and ponds and rivers in a dream, even so there are no varieties of joy or pleasure; but corresponding to the actions and the desires of man, the Ātman produces them all, without requiring any instruments like hands or feet for that purpose. In fact, the Ātman does not do anything; but that he is said to be the doer of all is only a description of him with reference to the upādhi of the mind which is active in the dream, and with reference to the Vasanāmaya body, the senses and the objects of desire. 10

105. *The extraordinary power of the Ātman to do and move as he likes*

The mind, however, is active in the dream because the Ātman never sleeps. What sleeps or does not move is the body. The Ātman, as the self-effulgent Seer, is ever awake; and therefore he becomes conscious of all the bodily and the external objects which arise in the dream on account of the desires in the waking life. And, then again, after the sleep is over, he comes back to the wakeful condition with all the senses refreshed and illumined for the purpose of doing actions. Alone, and as if made up of gold on account of the shining lustre of the Caitanya, the Puruṣa thus wanders through wakefulness and dream, as also through all the present and the future lives. Alone does the immortal, golden-coloured, lustrous Ātman wander during dream outside this dirty nest of the body, although he protects it by means of the fivefold Prāṇa, and goes wherever he wishes according to his desires. Assuming various forms of deities

and of animals and birds, this lustrous God appears during dream as if he is enjoying with women, laughing with joy with his friends, or fearing dreadful beings like tigers or lions. The sport of this Ātman becomes known to all, when he creates villages, towns, women, food, etc., as he wishes; but alas, what a misfortune of these people that none of them sees him, though he is capable of being seen!

That the Ātma-jyoti is different from the body and the senses during dream is also a popular belief. This is evident from what the men of medical profession tell, namely, that the sleeping person should not be awakened suddenly. For, the Ātman who has gone out of the body during sleep along with a particular organ of sense, may not return in the body in the same manner. Thereby perhaps a great defect like blindness, deafness, etc., may arise in the body and cause great anxiety and misery. This also shows that the Ātman has his own light during the dreaming condition. But there are others who believe that since objects in a dream are just like those in the wakeful condition, the dream should be considered as only a part of wakefulness rather than as an intermediary condition. But this is not correct. For, a dream occurs only when the activity of the senses ceases, and when the light from external source is not available. So whatever objects resembling those in the wakeful condition are seen in a dream they are there on account of the self-illuminating light of the Ātman.

Being satisfied with the description of the nature of the Ātman as being self-effulgent, eternal and quite different from the body, etc. Janaka said that he would present Yājñavalkya with a thousand coins. Yet, he knew that what was told by Yājñavalkya was only a part of the whole of the Brahma-vidyā. So, he requested him, 'Kindly have grace on me, O revered Yājñavalkya, and instruct me now in such a complete manner that I shall be made free from the bondage of saṁsāra'. 11-14

106. *The Ātman is free, uncontaminated and immortal*

The freedom which Janaka wished to have was the freedom from death. Yājñavalkya therefore continues to say: In the dream, the Ātman becomes a little bit free and clear from the dirt of the various bodily and the sensuous activities of the wak-

ing life. But during sleep, he becomes perfectly clear and distinct, or as will be told in *kaṇḍikās* 22 and 32 later, he goes beyond all misery and death and appears in his self-resplendent form. Even during dream, though he might look he is fatigued as if by his wandering and by various sportive activities with women and friends, he does nothing by way of merit or demerit. Nor can one truly say that the Ātman is the doer of actions even in the wakeful condition. For, what appears as his karma is on account of the upādhis of body, senses, mind and buddhi. As already explained in *kaṇḍikā* 7, the Ātman merely appears as thinking or making some movement. All the three states of wakefulness, dream, and sleep are therefore one in this respect, namely, that the Ātman never does anything in any one of them. He merely appears to move from one to the other, and then from that to the third, and again, in the reverse order, from sleep into dream, and from dream into the wakeful life. In no way can it be said that actions felt to be done in a dream bind a man. In fact, no one censures another for doing some bad action in a dream. How can the disembodied Ātman have any contact with the embodied, and how can he be said to perform any action? And, in the absence of karma, there can not be either birth or death. The Ātman therefore is the immovable, eternal Being. 15

Being again encouraged by Janaka's request to instruct him further, and not by the offering of a thousand coins more, Yājñavalkya continued his speech; 'Had the Ātman been really contaminated by the actions in the dream, he would have come back to the waking condition as being already contaminated. But, as said above, none ever cares so much of what takes place in a dream. No doubt, sometimes an atonement is prescribed for some bad, prophetic dream; but that is only to ward off the evil effects and not because the dream is a reality. And further, not only during the dreaming condition is the Ātman uncontaminated, he is so also during the waking life, though it is only by way of courtesy and practical convenience that he is called as the doer of actions (*kartā*). As explained above, as also in *kaṇḍikā* 7, he merely appears to be the doer owing to the upādhis of body, senses and the buddhi. Thus, in short, the immortal Ātman is altogether different in nature from all the three states, he remains ever uncontaminated though he appears

to move through all of them. Like a great fish who is not disturbed even by the great speed of the mid-current of a river, but who goes on moving from one bank to the other, the Puruṣa also moves from the dreaming to the waking consciousness, without being contaminated by the various desires and actions which are nothing but the forms of death. Thus, in short, is proved the immortality of Puruṣa, the Ātman. 16-18

The three states which Yājñavalkya was describing with the view to showing that the Ātman is eternally self-effulgent, pure and altogether different from all of them, are such that in each of them the Ātman appears to have a separate nature. In the wakeful condition, he appears to be contaminated by body senses and buddhi, as also by actions and their effects. In other words, he appears as if he is overcome by avidyā, and therefore as overtaken by death in the form of the body-complex and karma. The dream makes him a bit free from the consciousness of body, etc., but makes him as bound as before by the desires of the mind, while during sleep, after being fatigued by his wandering in the dreaming and wakeful states, he appears, no doubt, as being uncontaminated by body, karma, etc.; but even there, we do not get any evidence that he is free from avidyā. The purpose of this and the next *kaṇḍikā*, therefore, is to show that the Ātman is free from avidyā, and as such free from desires. And on being asked by Janaka as to why the Ātman wishes to enter into deep sleep, Yājñavalkya replied that he does so in order to avoid the miseries of the waking and the dreaming conditions. Just as a hawk soars high in the sky but being tired and exhausted by his flights, returns to his nest for taking rest, even so after incessantly wandering through the two states of wakefulness and dream, the Ātman becomes tired and wishing to go beyond them, takes rest in sleep. What he wishes to achieve thereby is to have no connection with desires and avidyā, nor with dreams, actions or the fruits of them. As the Śruti says, for that self-effulgent Ātman there remains nothing to choose between the dreams and the perceptual things of the world. In fact, the experience of sleep also is a kind of dream, as expressed in (At. Up. 1.3.12.) 19

107. *Mokṣa means the removal of avidyā by Ātma-vidyā*

In this connection a question arises as to what may be the nature of the Avidyā which is considered as the root-cause of all the miseries in this world. Is it a part of the nature of the Ātman or simply an attribute which can be ascribed to the Ātman? Or, is it something adventitious coming from outside? To clear these doubts is the aim of the present kaṇḍikā. Yājñavalkya tells that there are spread throughout the body of a man innumerable veins (nāḍis) which are as subtle as a hair cut breadth-wise into a thousand pieces. They contain in them sap of different colours and so appear to be white, blue, pink, green, and red. This difference in colour occurs on account of the increase or decrease of one or the other of the three humours in the body, namely, wind, bile, and phlegm. In these nāḍis resides the 'linga-śarīra' (the subtle body) which is made up of the five elements of earth, water, etc., the ten organs of sense and action, prāṇa and antaḥkaraṇa (the fourfold inner sense consisting of mind, intellect, attention, and egoism). But its main support is the desires of man; and therefore it is that man sees in his dream women, chariots, elephants, etc., as he desires. If the desires are bad enough, he sees in the dream fearful objects like tigers, or sees that he is being followed by an elephant for attacking him, or as being captured and beaten by thieves, or as falling in a deep and dirty pit.

Avidyā and Vidyā are poles apart, and the existence of them is inferred by the results which follow from them. Where there is the slightest feeling of difference, there exists the avidyā; and where there is the experience of the unity of all on account of the realization of the Ātman, there exists the Vidyā. With the increase of one of them, there occurs the decrease of the other, and vice versa. When one becomes the Self of all, then even during the dreaming condition he feels that he is the Caitanya and that he has no imperfection in any way. Notwithstanding this highest prize of Vidyā known as Mokṣa (liberation from the bondage of saṁsāra), which is possible to be possessed by any one who desires and puts in adequate efforts, what avidyā does is to make a man accept things which are other than the Ātman. Desires begin to beget in him, he does actions in order to fulfil his desires; and then, as they are being fulfilled, he becomes

more and more attached to them and to the actions which he does for that fulfilment. In short, he never gets out of the circle of desires, actions and fruits, and over and over again the repetitions of these. What must therefore be remembered is that the avidyā does not belong to the Ātman. It arises out of ignorance, just as the illusion that there is a serpent arises on account of the ignorance of the rope. But when the rope is seen, the illusion vanishes; even so, with the knowledge of the Ātman, the avidyā will be nowhere. So, what is known as Mokṣa is nothing but the removal of avidyā. 20

108. *During sleep, avidyā is not rooted out; it remains simply dormant*

More explicitly and directly is now being described the Ātman who, being the self of all, has been described till now as being free from avidyā, kāma (desires) and karma. As the Puruṣa sleeps in the Brahman, he does go naturally beyond all desires, beyond the dreaming condition, beyond all the signs of saṁsāra and beyond sin and fear. Just as in a close, sexual embrace, one forgets himself as also any other thing outside himself, even so when the jiva is in close contact with the Paramātmā during sleep, he forgets his own individuality as well as the manifold things of the world which are there as created by avidyā. No desire then falls outside him, so that he may cherish it. Though avidyā is not completely rooted out in sleep, it is at least absent so far as its effects, namely the desires are concerned. This might perhaps create the doubt that the desires are dependent on the Ātman for their support. But in order to ward off this doubt, the Ātman is further characterised as bereft of any desire (a-kāma). And, so, the Ātman is said to go beyond all grief.

A doubt might arise in this connection. Though it is correct to say that the Ātman goes beyond avidyā, kāma and karma during sleep, how does it follow that he has no knowledge of himself or of anything else, if he is self-effulgent? It was to remove this doubt that the illustration of the sexual embrace was cited. For, just as in that embrace there occurs no awareness of duality, even so, notwithstanding the self-effulgence of the Ātman, the fact that the Ātman is non-dual makes the man in sleep forget his individuality as distinct and separate from other

objects in the world. On no account can it therefore be said that the self-effulgence of the Ātman is of an adventitious character which gets itself attached to Kāma, Karma and Avidyā. Even avidyā cannot be said to be adventitious; but it is called so, because when it manifests, it brings in adventitious effects which cause misery and disaster. 21

In fact, it is the self-effulgence of the Ātman which enables a man who awakes from sleep to say that he was in sleep bereft of all desires. This happens because the connection which appears to be there between the karma and the Ātman during wakefulness is broken during sleep. For example, the awareness of the bond which exists between the father and the son during wakefulness, namely, that one is the begetter and the other begotten does not exist during sleep. Hence, the sleeping person cannot be called, so far as awareness in sleep is concerned, that he is the father or the son. Even so, the mother in the waking life ceases to be mother, when she sleeps. In the same way, there are no worlds to be conquered, no gods to be propitiated by performing sacrifices and no Vedic knowledge which is to be acquired. Nor can there be during sleep anyone who commits the sin of stealing a Brahmin's treasure of gold, or of killing him; nor can there be the distinction between merit and demerit. In short, as there cannot be any object of desire during dreamless sleep, which can otherwise be present in the heart of a man during his waking condition, the Ātman is said to be in his own pure uncontaminated, self-effulgent nature during sleep.

Bhārṭṛprapañca has altogether a different view about this which we shall now examine. He holds that the desires cling to the Ātman, since they are contained in the heart (ṛhdi-sthitāḥ), and that, even if they are driven out of the heart, they live in a residual manner in the Ātman, just as the fragrance of flowers which are put in oil lingers behind in the oil, even if the flowers are taken out of it. The heart is not only an instrument of producing desires, but also a receptacle for holding them; and because the heart is connected with the Ātman, the latter also can be said to be the second receptacle of the desires. But this is only to subvert what has already been proved, namely, that the Ātman is self-effulgent, Seer of all. With all this, to hold the ground still by saying that the jīva is a portion (aṁśa) of the Ātman and that the kāma resides in the jīva is to contradict what has

been already proved before, namely, that the Ātman is partless (Adhyāya Second, Kaṇḍikās 13 and 14). 22

109. *The sight of the Seer is not different from the Seer*

The eternal consciousness of the Ātman need not be doubted even during sleep; the light of that Seer can never be blinded. For, the sight is not different from the Seer, so that it can become an object for the Seer to see. Nor should the word 'Seer' be understood to mean that the Ātman is, like an ordinary being endowed with eyes, and is therefore capable of some such transitory action as the seeing of an object. Like the Sun who merely shines without being directly responsible for the various activities which occur in the world, the Ātman or the Seer sees by his eternal, natural sight, without doing any special effort to see. In fact, there are no objects to be seen, and no instruments and sense-organs needed for him to see. As there is no other seer except him, his sight can neither be considered as subservient to any other sight, nor it is comparable with the sensuous sight of the human beings which sometimes sees and sometimes not. It is the buddhi which sees when the eyes function well; but when they do not or when they are shut, the buddhi is not able to see. The Ātman being the witness of the buddhi only knows whether the buddhi sees or not. But it is these very two experiences of sensuous seeing or not seeing that go to prove the existence of the eternal sight of the Ātman. When the apparent, phenomenal seer, namely the jīva (pramātā), the objects in the waking and the dreaming conditions as obscured by avidyā (prameya), and the senses (pramāṇa) all become one with the Paramātmān during the condition of sound sleep, there cannot be any specific knowledge of anything, excepting that of illusory objects. But what exist throughout and, especially during sound sleep, is the eternal consciousness (sight) of the Ātman. 23

Even so, during sound sleep there exists nothing else but the Ātman, nothing of which he would like to have a smell or taste, or regarding which he would like to speak, or hear, or think, or touch, or know. But his power to smell or taste, etc., will never perish. So, there arises the feeling or the opinion that he neither smells nor tastes, etc., during sleep; but that he sees,

smells, etc., during the wakeful and dreaming conditions, is due to the wrong notions about the Ātman.

In this connection there arise these questions. Are seeing, hearing, thinking, etc., different qualities of the Ātman, just as heat, light and burning are of fire? Or, are they non-different from the Ātman, though they appear to be different from the Ātman on account of the upādhis of mind, eye, ear, etc.?

110. *Like ākāśa the Atman is one and partless*

First, let us begin with the Pūrvapakṣa in the form as stated by Bhartṛprapañca. The Ātman being an entity, like all other things in the world, he too can be conceived as being both one and many. For example, the cowness of a cow is one only; but considering that the cow has got feet, ears, horns, etc., one can say that the cow is made of many parts. Similarly, though the Ātman is supposed to be partless and therefore incapable of being thought of as consisting of many parts, one can infer about him and say that he too is like the cow or the horse. The Ātman is one indeed, but looking to the body and the different senses he can be said to be many also.

But this view is wrong. For, the various statements about the Ātman (in the kaṇḍikās 24 to 30) that during sleep he does not smell, hear, etc., are not intended for showing that smelling, hearing, etc. are different qualities (dharmaś) of the Ātman, but for silencing the possible doubt, namely, that if the Ātma-jyoti is self-effulgent, why should not the Ātman be able to see, smell, hear, etc., even during sound sleep. And the explanation is quite clear. During the two conditions of dream and wakefulness, the presence of the Caitanya or the Ātma-jyoti is inferable on account of the upādhis of seeing, smelling, etc., but during sound sleep, when all the upādhis of the eye, nose, ear, etc., are inactive, the same Caitanya, though it is present, appears to be as if it is not present, and therefore incapable of seeing, smelling, etc. The very fact that Caitanya appears to assume different forms of consciousness (buddhi-Vṛtti) on account of the upādhis of the senses and prāṇa shows that it is present in all the three states as one and the same, and not as many. To suppose that the Ātman has manyness in him is to contradict the Śruti-passages which tell us that the Ātman or Brahman is one, homogeneous,

compact of true knowledge and Ānanda. Just as the word 'Ākāśa' indicates that there is only one Ākāśa in spite of the artificial distinctions which are made in ordinary life, such as 'ghatākāśa', 'maṭhākāśa' (space in a jar or in a house), even so the word Caitanya indicates one Reality only, and not the apparent distinctions in it.

It cannot be an objection against the Vedānta only that it is unable to produce an illustration to show that the Ātman is one. Bhartṛprapañca also has assumed that a cow or horse is one only, though he is interested in pointing out that the animal consists of many parts such as horns, feet, etc. But, as said above, for the Vedāntin it is not simply an assumption that the Ātman is one. The very upādhis of eye, ear, etc., which create different forms of knowledge such as seeing, hearing, etc., are sufficient proof of the one, self-effulgent, upādhi-less Ātman, just as the different colours, such as red, green or blue which appear to belong to a crystal on account of the different, coloured things which are brought in contact with the crystal, are sufficient to show that the crystal must be of an altogether different nature, namely, pure and white. Or, just as the light of the one sun which is pure and white appears to be of different colours if it passes through different coloured glasses, even so, the Ātma-jyoti which is one and which illumines the whole world and the sense-organs, can assume and appear as being of different forms. And just as there can be no activity or movement in the one partless Ākāśa, how can there be any distinctions of qualities or dharmas which spring up on account of activity? What is true of Ākāśa is also true of Paramāṇu (the smallest atom). The earth-atom, for example, which already possesses the quality (dharma) of the earth, namely, smell, cannot be conceived as having a further quality of its own. If anyone would say that the earth-atom can also be wet, it cannot be so unless it is made wet by the upādhi, namely, of the sprinkling of water over it. The wetness of the earth-atom is only a separable appendix; for the atom is partless and indivisible. In a like manner, the Ātman too being partless and indivisible, all talk about the distinctions and qualities will only show that they are due to upādhis, and not as belonging to the Ātman.

111. *The supreme Brahmanānda is on the top of all other kinds of ānanda*

There still arises a doubt regarding the nature of the Ātman. What is then ultimately true? Whether the Ātman has the capacity to have specific knowledge or not? If he has, sleep becomes impossible, and if he has not, the conditions of wakefulness and dream become impossible. The reply is that during the two latter conditions, it is the avidyā which falsely creates things and which the Ātman sees as if they are different from him. Otherwise, he being one and there being nothing else, there can be no specific knowledge of anything during sleep. Neither are there the objects created by avidyā, nor the senses through which knowledge is acquired in the waking life. Whom then will he be able to see or smell or know? As the jīva is embraced during sleep by the desireless, perfectly satisfied, Self-effulgent and pure Ātman he becomes identical with the Ātman. 'This is, O sovereign, said Yājñavalkya, the fearless, immortal, Brahma-loka or the Brahman himself. This is the highest destination of the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa in whom there would be no trace of avidyā; this is higher than the position of the gods; higher than any other world or treasure which can be had by the doing of karma. This is the highest and the imperishable Ānanda, which is far more exalted than the happiness due to sensuous pleasures. It is by the power and support of a digit of this supreme Ānanda, that all other beings created by avidyā live and enjoy the pleasures of the senses. 31, 32

It is this supreme Ānanda which is now being defined in this Kaṇḍikā, by telling us how the different stages of it rise one over the other, and how, as if, mathematically, every stage of it is measured by multiplying the earlier quantity of Ānanda by one hundred. The motive, however, is not to give a quantitative estimate of that highest Ānanda, but to inform us that the qualitative difference between it and the smallest unit of it known to man is like the difference between the north and the south poles. The Ānanda of a sovereign who is perfectly sound in body, whose limbs and sense-organs function efficiently, and who is endowed with all the sources and the means of enjoyment, will serve the purpose of the unit to measure the different kinds of ānanda. This is the unit of ānanda known to man.

The point to note with reference to this as well as to all the kinds of it which shall be presently described, is that Ānanda is not something separate from one who has it, but as identical with him. So, the mathematical measurement is not simply of ānanda only but of the various beings who rise one above the other on account of the rising of the Ānanda. Therefore the human ānanda, when it is multiplied by one hundred becomes the ānanda of the Fathers. A hundred times more of this is the Ānanda of Gandharvas; a hundred times more of this is that of those who obtain the status of gods by means of karma; a hundred times more of this is that of those who are already gods, as also of those who are sinless and have no desires and who have studied the Vedas; a hundred times of this is that which is available in the world of Prajāpati that is of the Virāt Puruṣa, and is also of those who have studied the Vedas, and who are sinless and have no desires; and a hundred times of this ānanda is that which is the Ānanda of Brahmaloṇa that is, of the Hiranyagarbha, as also of those who have studied the Vedas and who are sinless and have no desire. Beyond this is the supreme and the infinite Ānanda of Brahman O sovereign', said Yājñavalkya. All these different varieties of ānanda including that of the Hiranyagarbha are but drops in the infinite sea of Ānanda. To obtain this, the study of the Vedas and sinlessness are not enough. What is indispensable is absolute Vairāgya or utter desirelessness. 33

112. *The jiva travels along with Linga-deha to a new body*

Thus, when all the while Yājñavalkya was speaking about how to achieve liberation from bondage. Janaka thought that he was being instructed indirectly by means of illustrations and analogy. He therefore requested Yājñavalkya to tell him directly about the bondage and liberation. But as illustrations alone are possible in a conversation regarding Brahma-vidyā, Yājñavalkya again referred to the illustration of the fish who moves from one bank of the river to the other in order to show how the soul wanders to and fro between dream and wakefulness. And, then, further by way of analogy, Yājñavalkya explained how the soul leaves one body and obtains another. Just as a cart which is very heavily loaded moves with a rattling noise, even so the soul carrying

the burden of the subtle body known as 'līṅga-deha' travels to and fro between birth and death. In fact, the Ātman does not travel at all, but he appears to do so on account of the upādhi of the 'līṅga-deha'. And when the prāṇa leaves the body and when the vital parts are being torn and destroyed, the soul cries bitterly with grief. In view of this horrible prospect of the human destiny at the time of death, the Upaniṣad advises us to resort to Vairāgya and do all we can to achieve the highest end of the human life, namely, the realization of the Brahman. 34, 35

And, in order to emphasize the importance of having Vairāgya as soon as possible, Yājñavalkya further explained how and why a man dies. When the body becomes too weak to do anything on account of oldage or illness, then, just as a fruit which has lost its connection with the tree falls to the ground, the jīva also becomes dissociated from the body and the sense-organs. Then the prāṇa also goes with the līṅga-deha, and enters a new body which is made up of the five elements, according as he is destined to reap the fruits of his past actions and knowledge. Then, just as officers in high places, leaders of the people, and lords keep on waiting for receiving their new king with various presents, even so all the elements and their presiding deities would wait to receive the departed jīva back into a new home which they keep already prepared and furnished with appropriate fruits according to his past karmas. And, when they come to know that he is coming, they all voluntarily go forward to welcome and receive him. 36, 38

ADHYĀYA FOURTH : BRĀHMAṆA FOURTH

113. *At the time of death the līṅga-deha departs through the eye, the ear or any other region*

The purpose of this Brāhmaṇa is to describe in details how and when the jīvātman leaves the body with all its members. The Ātman being disembodied cannot be said to become weak or inscient; but on account of the extreme weakness of the body and the inability of the senses to perceive, the jīva is described as becoming so at the time of death. So long as there is life in the body, the divinities of the several senses, such as the Sun

etc., become serviceable to the jīva in enabling him to see, hear, etc. But at the time of death they all return to their original source, namely, the Sun, the Wind, etc., and the jīva too retires in its self-effulgent source of the Ātman in the heart. In other words, when the various divinities cease to support the functioning of the senses, the latter become all collected together in the heart and become identified with the 'līṅgātmā', that is, the jīva who, being constituted by the complex of desire, wishes also to depart from the body. Then, at this time of the departure from the body, it is said of the dying man that he becomes unable to see, hear, touch, think, or understand. 1

Thus, at the time of death, there occur the twofold phenomena namely, the departure of the governing deities of the senses to their original sources, and of the assembling of all the senses in the heart of the dying man. Then, what happens in the heart is that it becomes extremely illumined by the light of the Caitanya which assumes the form of the mental state indicating the kind of desires which the dying man wishes to fulfil in his future birth. It is therefore on account of the upādhi of the līṅga-deha of the dying man, that the Ātman is said to be transmigratory in nature, and therefore subject to birth and death. If the destination is intended to be the abode of the Sun, and if the knowledge of that deity and actions done by the person are appropriate, the Ātman as characterized by the līṅga-deha makes its exit through the eyes. If the intended destination is Brahmloka, and if there is, as before, the support of knowledge, devotion (upāsana) and action, he goes out of body through the region of the head. Likewise he departs through other regions of the body according as there is the backing of a particular vidyā and the study of the Vedas. And then, just as a king is followed by the chief minister, even so the departing soul is followed by the other prāṇas of speech and other senses.

114. *Vidyā, Karma and Vāsanā (desires) follow the departed soul*

Like in a dream then the jīvātman becomes full of knowledge not independently and as he wishes, but as the saṁskāras (impressions) of the actions which he might have done and the knowledge which he might have acquired during his life-time are, though that vidyā and karma are associated with his desire and

ambition to attain a particular status or condition in the life to come after death. However in order that the jīva should be able before he dies to wish exactly what he wants to obtain in a life after death, Śruti tells us to undergo the practice of not only the yogic discipline which consists of the control over the senses and of restraint of the imaginings of the mind, but also of doing meritorious acts of doing good to others out of faith and humility. All this, however, cannot be done at the time of death only. Therefore it is very necessary, as the Bhagavadgītā tells us, 8.6 that what one might wish to be at the time of death, should be borne in mind throughout one's life before death and must be supported by suitable actions. But even then karma alone will not be sufficient to prevent the evil of the bondage of Samsāra. Nor will the favours of the several deities be of any avail in this respect. For, after all, the deities also are a part of the perishable samsāra. The only effective remedy to overcome the bondage is what all the Upaniṣads tell us, the realization of the Brahman. Excepting this, whatever vidyā and karma¹ are achieved during one's life-time, as also the consequent desire to obtain the fruit of them (known as Pūrva-prajñā) go along with the departing soul.

One might say that there is nothing wrong in saying that vidyā and karma follow the departing soul, inasmuch as they are the means of enjoying the fruits. but that he might wonder as to why the vāsanā also should accompany that soul. It should therefore be noted that vāsanā too is intimately connected with both the actions and the fruits thereof. Without the active support of the desire which has become strong on account of the prior experience (Pūrva-prajñā), whether in this life or in the previous one, no one will be able to employ his organs of action efficiently in doing a new work, or to enjoy the fruits of it with satisfaction. It is a common experience that some people are well up in drawing

¹Dhyāna (contemplation) is the vidyā which is prescribed; to see a naked woman is a Karma which is forbidden; knowledge about the sensuous objects like jars is vidyā which requires no prohibition; while the casual awareness of insignificant things on the road is vidyā which can not be forbidden. Similarly, speech and other acts of sensuous knowledge is karma which is prescribed; the killing of a brahmin is a forbidden karma; walking and winking of the eye-lids are the non-prescribed and the non-forbidden karmas, respectively.

pictures or in some other arts, even though they have not learnt them in their present life; while there are others who cannot properly manage to do even ordinary and easy works. Similar is the difference between the capacity and incapacity of men to enjoy. All this is due to the fact that in some people the Pūrva-prajñā is strong enough to enable them to act and enjoy, while in others it is either absent or too weak to stimulate any action or any craving for enjoyment. In short, vidyā, karma and vāsanā (Pūrva-prajñā) are the threefold food which would be useful to the departed soul in his journey towards the obtainment of a new body in the life to come. Therefore, if any one is desirous of having an excellent body and excellent enjoyments in his next life, he should try to acquire excellent knowledge and do excellent actions in his present life.

115. *Opinions regarding transmigration*

Thus transmigrates the departed soul to inhabit another body, just as a bird flies from one tree to another. This is according to the opinion of the Jains belonging to the Digambara cult. Some others hold that it is carried from one body to another to the place where he is to be born by a being who is known as 'Ativāhaka'. The Sāṃkhyaas say that the senses of the departing jiva become endowed with all the efficiency which they would have in a new life. In the opinion of the Vaiśeṣikas, it is only the mind which goes to the place where the new body is to be obtained. And there is also the correct Vedāntic view that the senses which become contracted at the time of death become scattered and all-pervading after death, like the light of a lamp which being confined in a jar loses its contracted form as soon as the jar is broken and it becomes spread in all the directions. But just as when the lamp is confined in another jar the light of it becomes contracted again, even so when the soul obtains a new body, the senses too become contracted in their capacity to know and to act. This means that though the power of the senses in their Adhidaivika aspect is infinite and omnipresent like that of their governing deities, it does become limited and differentiated on account their coming in contact with the Adhyātmika and the Adhibhautika elements, namely, with a new body and the fruits of the soul's past vidyā, karma and

vāsanā, respectively. This contraction and expansion of the capacity of the senses is due to the fact that they all are supported by the chief Prāṇa which, as the Śruti tells us, is infinite and all-pervading. It becomes as small as a speck or an insect, or as big as an elephant, or even as large as the three worlds. And it is on this account that one becomes small or great as is his upāsanā of the limited or the unlimited. 2

116. *Vāsanā creates a new subtle body which then grows into a gross one*

Regarding the manner in which the departing soul leaves his body and accepts a new one, the Paurāṇikas describe fancifully that he travels along with his gross body to the new world of destination! But the truth is that just as an insect on a blade of grass does not leave the blade till it gets hold of another blade of grass, even so the vāsanā (Pūrva-prajñā) which is controlled by Vidyā and karma and which is stuck up in the heart begins to create a new and a subtle body even while it resides in the old body, and does not leave it till the jiva becomes sufficiently attached to the new one. There spring up the various organs also with all their capacities to cognize and function in their respective manner. And when all this preparation is made, the subtle body grows into a gross one; and then the various governing deities like fire (Agni) and others give their support and power to all the senses, namely, the eye, the ear, etc. All this is analogous to what happens in a dream. Even while the soul is living in a particular body, he creates in the dream another body, and thinking that he is a king or some other person forgets what he was in the waking condition. 3

A further point of interest in this connection is the question regarding the material out of which the second body is formed. Is it the same old material of the five elements which is moulded into another form, or is it something altogether new? As there is the Māyā beyond the five elements, namely, the earth, water, fire, wind, and ākāśa, it cannot be said that the material cause of the new body is either the five elements only or something altogether new, besides the Māyā and the elements. Therefore, the Upaniṣad tells us that just as a goldsmith takes a portion of gold and moulds it into different beautiful forms, even so the

Ātman breaks up the five elements of Māyā which are already there and moulds out of them new and ever new and beautiful bodies, wherein can reside the Manes, the Gandharvas, the gods and even the Prajāpati, according as they possess the vidyā and karma. From this it will be clear that the subtle portions of the five elements also follow the departing soul (liṅgātmā) so that the formation of a new body should be possible. 4

117. *The Ātman alone becomes Vijñānamaya, Manomaya, Prāṇamaya, Cakṣurmaya, etc.*

No doubt, this Ātman is the Brahman. But whatever upādhis, including buddhi and others, had bound the Ātman in a particular life, and due to which he appeared as having the same nature as the upādhis had, become again collected together in the new life of the soul. Naturally, again, the Ātman appears as being endowed with several qualities. Being associated and identified with buddhi, he is said to be Vijñānamaya, and as the doer of actions and enjoyer of their good and bad fruits. He becomes connected with the mind, and is therefore said to be Manomaya and as the object of sight. He appears to make movements on account of his connection with Prāṇa and is therefore known as Prāṇamaya. As the senses begin to function he becomes known as Cakṣurmaya, Śrotramaya, etc. And then, with the growth of each of the elements in the body, he becomes Pṛthivīmaya (of the nature of earth), Āpomaya (of the nature of water), especially in the world of Varuṇa (the Lord of water), and so on, as Vāyumaya and Ākāśamaya (though ākāśa has no parts, but is all the same a created being, and is therefore an upādhi). In the same way, he becomes Tejomaya (of the nature of light or fire) and assumes the bodies of gods, or in case the light is lacking, he assumes the forms of beasts, etc., or even those of corpse-like ghosts in the hell. Thus, in short, being carried away by all sorts of desires and consequently being bound by the chain of cause and effect, he becomes Kāmamaya (full of desires). But when, after having discovered that 'such a life is full of misery, he becomes disgusted with it, he becomes A-(not)-kāmamaya, that is calm, composed and bereft of any desire. If, however, in the process of becoming Kāmamaya he is disturbed or prevented, he becomes immediately enraged

(Krodhamaya); but when his anger is stilled by some means or other, he becomes calm, joyful and a-krodhamaya. In other words, he becomes either Dharmamaya or a-dharmamaya and as these two constitute all that exists, he becomes 'Sarvamaya' that is identical with this, that or anything else; identical with sensuous objects, with the states of mind, and with actions of merit or demerit. Thus it is that, according to the Pūrvapakṣa, the doing of puṇya and pāpa is responsible for the transmigration of the soul from one body to another. 5

118. *But the most fundamental cause of saṁsāra is the ignorance of the Reality*

All this is accepted by the Siddhāntin also. It is the mind which cherishes desires, and it is the mind which makes a determination to get them fulfilled. And when the desires are fulfilled, they become stronger still and compel the man to put in more and more efforts for their fulfilment. This, however, does not make the whole story; and so, transmigration is not the only destiny of the soul. With the acceptance of kāma as a fundamental cause of saṁsāra, it does not become the inevitable cause of existence. In fact, as the Siddhāntin holds, beyond kāma, there is another more fundamental and ultimate cause of saṁsāra. It is the ignorance of what is Real; and of this, kāma is only an accessory cause. That is why when the kāma is subdued, and ignorance is removed, the soul ceases to migrate, the prāṇas do not depart, and there occurs, the knowledge of the Real, or what is the same thing, as the realization of the Brahman. One who has no desires becomes automatically free from the bondage of actions: for they do not yield any fruits. The Akāmayamāna becomes, in other words, niṣkriya without any trouble. But why and when do the cravings or the desires leave a man? The reply is that they leave him when he becomes Āptakāma, that is, when he gets what he wishes to have; when, in other words, his 'kāma' is fulfilled. What then is this Kāma? It is none else but the Ātman who is without any other thing inside or outside, one, homogenous consciousness. One who has realized the Ātman becomes the Ātman. Then there remains nothing which he should desire to have, and so there would be no occasion for him to do any action (karma). There remains

nothing for him which he shall accept or reject; naturally, no kind of karma can ever contaminate him. He becomes liberated by the very condition of his having realized the Ātman, even while he is living; and so it is not necessary for him to wait till the fall of his body.

119. *Liberation means the realization of the Ātman, even while one is living, or after death*

Besides, to say that liberation consists in obtaining a different and novel condition after death is to set at naught the view that liberation means to realize the unity of the soul with the Ātman. Moreover the implication is that liberation is the result of some kind of karma and that it is not the same thing as jñāna (illuminational knowledge). Liberation, in that case, would be as transitory as any other fruit of actions. One may contend that the condition of having realized the Brahman might be said to be non-transitory in the sense in which destruction (dhvaṃsa) of a thing can be said to be by the Naiyāyikas. If a jar is broken, the brokenness of it is eternally permanent. But this is wrong. The destruction of which the Naiyāyika speaks has got only a nominal existence corresponding to which there exists nothing tangible. It is only a negation; a continued non-existence of something which existed at one time, but of which nothing exists after it has been destroyed. Liberation, however, has a positive meaning and actual existence. Like the natural light and heat of the fire, liberation is the natural and inseparable characteristic of the Ātman. And, just as light and heat cannot be said to be the result of the activity of fire, even so liberation is not dependent for its being on the activities of any human being. Because the human perception of the light and heat of fire is dependent upon the burning of wood, it cannot be said that they are not the characteristics of fire. What the burning of the wood does is only to manifest those characteristics which exist already in fire, but which are hidden from the human eyes on account of the wood itself. When the wood begins to burn, it does not create light and heat which were not there already in fire. The destruction of the wood by being burnt means the removal of the obstacle which was preventing the man to become aware of the light and heat of fire. When the wood begins to

burn, the fire begins to manifest its inherent, natural characteristics of light and heat. Even so, with the realization of the Ātman, there comes about inevitably the liberation of the soul. In fact, the illuminational knowledge or the realization of the Ātman is itself the liberation. It can never be the result of any action (karma).

Similarly, as there is nothing but the highest Ātman, there is no jiva who can be said to be bound. To say therefore that liberation consists in the freedom from bondage is also not correct. Strictly speaking, it is freedom from the supposed feeling of being bound, which is due to the ignorance of the Ātman. Just as the false perception of a serpent which is superimposed upon a rope on account of the non-perception (ignorance) of the rope, goes away the moment the rope is perceived even so the feeling of being bound which is the effect of the ignorance of the Ātman goes away as soon as the Ātman is seen.

120. *The locus of the knowledge and of the joy of the Atman is the Ātman itself.*

It will be interesting to note at this stage how the joy which arises out of the realization of Ātman is altogether different in nature from that of the sensuous objects. In the former, the locus of both the knowledge and the joy is the Ātman only; in the latter, the knowledge being dependent upon the contact of the sense with the object, the loci of knowledge and joy are in different places. A wall can eclipse the perception of a jar; but in the condition of liberation, neither dharma nor adharma will be able to obstruct the vision of the Ātman. Besides there being no bifurcation between subject and object, the knowledge and joy of the Atman are eternally and naturally the very constituents of the Atman, and not related to it as mere adjectives of a substantive. Nor are they related with each other in the same way. Both are involved simultaneously and necessarily in the perception of the Ātman. Nor can it be said that the person who was first immersed in saṁsāra and one who is liberated must be different from the Paramātmān. For, the real nature of the jiva, whether it is before or after liberation, is ever non-different from the Ātman. His being immersed in

saṁsāra is only an act of forgetfulness or ignorance of his being the Ātman in reality. It is for the sake of removing this ignorance or forgetfulness that the study of the Śāstras and the undergoing of the moral and the spiritual discipline are meant, just as the light of a lamp is necessary to remove the illusion of a serpent on a rope. Whatever then appears on the Ātman and is therefore describable in language and in practical life as, 'I am a saṁsārin', 'I know', 'I do not know', 'I am so and so', etc., is all due to 'Avidyā', and so, can never impair the undifferentiated nature and the purity of the Ātman, just as the appearance of a serpent on a rope can never change the real nature of the rope, or just as the perception of two moons by one who is suffering from jaundice will never affect the moon. How can then karma and ignorance which are the products of avidyā eclipse the nature of the Ātman? Even so, pleasure, pain, desires, efforts, etc., can never be the qualities of the Ātman. Even the knowledge, 'I am ignorant' is there on account of self-effulgent nature of the Ātman. He is neither bound nor liberated, neither ignorant nor wise; he is non-dual, unmodifiable, without birth, old age or death, one homogeneous, immortal Brahman. Therefore, even the statement that a person who is already the Brahman becomes the Brahman, is possible only by way of courtesy. 6

121. *The prāṇas of the liberated are merged in Brahman*

Thus when all the desires pertaining to this world or to the worlds beyond death, such as desires for progeny, wealth and power, which are deeply rooted in the heart of a man are completely destroyed by having realized the Brahman, what is attained by him is the immortal life only. All the desires about the sensuous objects are then felt as things which are lifeless. So, when death as caused by avidyā is warded off by the realization of the Ātman, the jīva is liberated even while he is living, and there remains no reason why his prāṇas should leave him at the time of death and migrate to some other place and body. They become merged in him, and his body becomes merged in its cause. His individual existence then has only a nominal value; for he becomes the Self of all. His body has no more value for him, as a serpent has for the dead skin which

he has cast away from his body. Under the influence of avidyā, he used to think that he had a body, and so he was considered as a mortal being. But when the avidyā becomes destroyed by Vidyā, that is by the realization of Brahman, he considers himself as being the disembodied, immortal Brahman, even though he resides in the same old body. 7

The following are the verses which explain this topic very clearly. The way to the realization of the Brahman is very difficult to be followed on account of its being subtle. It is as vast or infinite as the Brahman is. It is known as the most ancient of all; that is, it is far removed from the modern, crooked way of the logicians. And, as the Mādhyandins read 'Vitarah' (what enables to cross) for 'Vitataḥ' (spread out vastly), the way has to be described as enabling people to cross the ocean of saṁsāra. It is about this Jñāna that Yājñavalkya says that he had been not only fortunate to find it out, but that he had been also completely satisfied by treading upon it fully, just as an hungry man should be satisfied not only by merely getting the food but also by eating it to his heart's content. This does not, however, mean that Brahma-vidyā can become the exclusive property of a single person here or there; it is meant for all including the gods in heaven, provided they have intelligence and courage. They can all become liberated even while they are living, and continue to be so even after the fall of their body. 8

122. *Ways like Devayāna, and Pitṛyāna and notions of puṇya and pāpa, refer to Saṁsāra only*

People who are desirous of going by this path describe it, however, in different ways. Some say that it is white, some say it is blue, and some others call it as green or red. It is done so probably by taking into consideration the colours of the various Nāḍis. There are others who do so because the Sun who moves from the North to the South and vice versa, and who is also described as being white, blue, etc., is responsible for the belief that there are two ways of departure for the soul after death, namely, the Devayāna (known also as Arcimārga) and the Pitṛyāna (Dhūmamārga). Whether the soul departs through one or other part of the body, such as the

eye or the head, or whether it departs by Devayāna and goes up to the region of the Brahmadeva, the description has reference only to a sojourn in the realm of saṁsāra. It has nothing to do with the Mokṣamārga, which consists in realizing the Ātman, and thereby in putting a stop to all cravings and desires. As there is then no question of departure and transmigration, the various 'indriyas' (prāṇas) also become merged in the Ātman. One who has renounced all his desires (eṣaṇās) is alone able to travel by this Jñāna-mārga and realize the Brahman. Not only does he perform meritorious acts and removes all his desires from his heart, but what he also does is to realize the Ātman and the identification of the Atman with the Paramātman (Brahman). That is why he is described as 'Puṇyakṛt' and 'Taijas' (as having merit and light). This need not, however, mislead anyone into believing that the knower of the Brahman is required to combine in him both knowledge and puṇya. For, as we have observed several times, there is the clear opposition between Jñāna and Karma (including even puṇya karma). And, if the mokṣa is the same as jñāna, both pāpa and puṇya are to be overcome before one attains liberation. As the Smṛti says (M.B. Śāntiparva, 47-55), 'I bow to the mokṣa in the form of the Ātman, attaining which persons renounce everything, go beyond both pāpa and puṇya and become calm and fearless regarding rebirth. It will be told even at the end of this Brāhmaṇa (4.4.23) that the greatness of the realizer of the Brahman is neither increased nor decreased by the doing or the non-doing of Karma, and that, therefore, one should expect to have complete peace after having put a stop to all actions whatsoever. In short, whoever goes by the jñānamārga is puṇyakṛt¹ and taijas' (lustrous). 9

123. *Reserved are the dark worlds for the ignorant, while bliss and fearlessness are for the realizers of the Atman*

With the view to expressing now in bold relief the excellence of the jñānamārga, the Upaniṣad brings in disrepute other ways of life which are opposed to it. Those who are engaged in

¹The word Puṇya in 'Puṇyakṛt' means not the ordinary deeds of merit, such as performance of sacrifice, charity, etc., but the extraordinary puṇya of realizing the Atman.

doing such karma as constituting the worship and the propitiation of deities, etc., enter into the darkness of ignorance which is the prominent characteristic of saṁsāra. But those who follow the teaching of the ritualistic aspect of the three Vedas under the impression that it alone constitutes the Vidyā, and therefore neglect the remaining portion of the Vedas which consists of the Atma-vidyā as useless, enter into greater darkness. There, within that darkness of ignorance are enveloped several worlds which are devoid of any kind of joy. Into these worlds enter the people who have turned their back on the knowledge of the Atman. If, however, there be any person for whom there is nothing more desirable than the Atman, and who has become the Self of all, then he will never come to grief on account of the miseries in life and distress to his body, just as a man who has no knowledge of the Atman would certainly be. Not only will he become free from bodily afflictions but he will also become blessed by having fulfilled the purpose of his life. For, though the Atman is living in the body which is as if a dense forest of dangers, calamities and diseases, he has been directly realized by that person. No longer there remains any difference between him and the Atman; and so, it can be said about that person that he is the creator and the Self of all. Naturally, in the reverse manner, it can then be said of everything else that it is the Self of that person, 'It is good', said Yājñavalkya, 'I have realized the Atman while living in body. Otherwise, had I not known Him, great and untold calamities would have fallen over me, and there would have been no freedom from the rounds of birth and death. Alas, how unfortunate it is that people consider the body as the Atman, and so embrace countless miseries. But why should one who has been graced by a kind-hearted Guru and who then following his instruction directly sees the resplendent Atman, the Lord of all the happenings in time, fear anyone else? He, being the Self of all, will not censure anyone else; nor will he seek any protection from fear, since he realizes that he is himself the Lord (Isana). 10-15

124. *The spiritual teacher can mould the mind of the disciple*

As it is by the light of the Brahman that the Sun and other

lights shine, and as Kāla (Time) which comes into being from the Brahman, and which determines the life-span of everything else except that of the Brahman by means of its limbs, as it were, namely, the day and night, the gods too worship the Brahman as the one, immortal light (jyoti), with the desire that they should live long. Therefore, one who has a desire to live long should worship this Lord, this Īśāna or the Brahman as the very principle of life (Āyuh) itself. 'As for me', says Yājñavalkya, 'I have become immortal because I do not consider the Ātman as different from this immortal Brahman in which the five kinds of beings find their support.' Those are the Gandharvas, the Manes, the gods, the Asuras and the Rākṣasas. Or they might be considered as being the four castes, namely, the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, Śudra and Niṣāda. Or again, even the five Prāṇas can be considered as the five beings who take their support in that Ātmajyoti, inasmuch as it is by the power of the latter that the Prāṇa can do its function of breathing, and that the eyes, the ears and the other senses derive the power of seeing, hearing etc. Without the power of Brahman in them, they are as inert as wood or a clod of earth. They are only instruments which can function only when they receive the power from a source which is different from them. The mind too is dependent on that Ātman for its power to think. Therefore the Ātman can never be thought of as being the object which can be perceived by the senses or the mind. Those who know this also come to know that the Brahman is the most ancient and the primus of all. And yet, paradoxically, one shall perceive the Brahman by means of the mind only. But this is possible only after one receives instructions from a spiritual teacher, that is, when the mind becomes trained and cultivated by following the instruction of the teacher. Then the mind itself becomes moulded into the nature of the Brahman. To put it differently, the Brahman becomes perceivable by the mind's enhanced spiritual power to comprehend. Or, as some knowers of the Brahman say, the Brahman is capable of being enveloped, as if by a unique state of the mind. This, however, need not raise the doubt that there is involved in Brahma-jñāna, the distinctions of the seer, the seen and the sight. For, whatever distinction or manifoldness is seen it is an appearance which is super-imposed on the Brahman on account of the upādhis of the Avidyā.

And so, one who finds manyness in the Brahman moves from death to death only. 19

125. *Constant meditation will remove false appearances*

According to the instruction of the spiritual preceptor, then, the Brahman should be seen as one, homogeneous, continuous mass of consciousness like the indivisible expanse of ākāśa. It is eternal, immovable, and cannot be discerned by any means of knowledge except through the instruction (Āgama) of one who has realized the Ātman. What Āgama does is to conceal the impressions created by the false superimpressions of body and other upādhis on the Brahman. What then remains to be known is the residual being, namely, the Ātman. That Brahman is eternally of the nature of the Ātman is a fact which is not to be created anew by a sort of make-believe or assumption. The upādhi-less Ātman or Brahman shines by its own lustre, when the false appearances on it are removed by constant meditation on what is instructed by the preceptor. The Ātman cannot be measured; for, in his own nature of consciousness or Caitanya, he cannot be said to be the object of any kind of knowledge. He is pure in the sense that he is devoid of the dirt of dharma and adharmā; subtler and more pervasive than ākāśa; free from the defects of decay and destruction because he is without birth; and is immortal and greater than the greatest. An intelligent Brāhmaṇa therefore, should quench his thirst for knowing the Brahman, by means of studying the Vedic literature and by following the instruction of his spiritual teacher. He should abandon the forbidden karma as well as that which seeks the fulfilment of desires. He should resort to the practice of having control over the senses, have forbearance and peace of mind, and should meditate upon 'Aum' or some other short verbal symbol of Brahman. For, to meditate upon a symbol which consists of many words will only cause fatigue to the tongue. 20-21

126. *Being the Lord of Karma, Brahman is not affected by good or bad deeds*

It is about this very great pure Ātman which has been described so far that the 22nd Kaṇḍikā intends to tell us further that the

entire body of the Vedas, excluding that portion which deals with Kāmya Karma, is interested in conveying to us the instruction that the self is identical with the Brahman. This is the same self or the Ātman who is known as the Vijñānamaya and who resides in the ākāśa of the heart, that is in the buddhi, and who becomes one with the Paramātman during sleep. He is the Lord and the controller of all, and is so thoroughly independent that he is not in any way augmented by the performance of good deeds, nor does he suffer any deficiency in his nature by the committing of evil deeds. This quality of not being affected by good or bad deeds follows from his being the Lord of Karma. He is as if the bund whereby he protects the worlds and the social order of castes (varṇa) and āśramas from being toppled down. The three castes of Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas realize Him by means of repeating the Vedic hymns and sacrifices which are not meant for obtaining any desired objects in saṁsāra. For, though not directly, Karma which is not meant for the fulfilment of worldly desires, is very useful in enabling one to have the knowledge of Brahman. After mentioning forty saṁskāras, Gautama also narrates the great importance of eight ethico-spiritual virtues, such as compassion, forgiveness, non-jealousy, purity, etc. The Bhgavadgītā also mentions (18.5) that sacrifice, charity and penance are the means of purifying the soul, and that knowledge would emerge out of it. Thus, in short, the karma-kāṇḍa of the Vedas is not incompatible with the Jñāna-kāṇḍa.

127. *Even so one who contemplates on the Ātman renounces everything else*

Yet with all this, it is by means of contemplation (manana) on the Ātman, that one can at all be called as a sage (muni). Any thing less than this will make him Karmī and not a muni. But one who is a muni will never be a Karmī that is one who does not do any contemplation. One wishing to go to Haridwāra will not go eastward to Kāśī. Similarly, one who wishes to realize the Ātman will not care for the three worlds, which can be obtained by means of producing progeny, performance of the sacrificial rituals and propitiation of deities. He will only be anxious to obtain the Ātmaloka, and not this world, nor the Pitṛloka nor the Devaloka; and so, he will be prepared to

resort to complete renunciation (sannyāsa, known as Pārivrājya) of Karma. As there is nothing common between the Atmaloka and the other three lokas, there is nothing common between Jñāna and Karma. Therefore, nothing is to be done for obtaining the Atman which is the only omnipresent Reality, except the sublation of the false superimpositions of avidyā on the Atman. And this can be done by means of renunciation which is more an internal means than an external one of removing desires and cravings which act as motives for doing actions. Besides, if the realizer of the Atman becomes the Self of all, including even the above-mentioned three lokas, there seems to be no reason why he should care for them or for any of the saṃskāras or for sacrifices or charity, as if they are going to bestow upon him something more precious than the Atman. As the Ātman is neither to be produced, nor brought out from some place, nor is modifiable, nor capable of being refined or polished, karma has no purpose to serve, except in the case of those who wrongly consider their body and the senses as the Ātman. One who knows that there is no water but mirage will hardly run to the place of the mirage for the purpose of drinking water. Even so, the realizer of the Ātman would never expect the bliss of the Ātman in the worlds which are far removed from the life in the Ātman. To expect the impossible is like the search for foot-prints of the birds which have flown in the sky. Therefore what one should do is to realize the Ātman and to renounce the karma.

128. *Sannyāsa is recommended for achieving and stabilizing the Ātma-jñāna*

It need not be supposed that Sannyāsa or the Pārivrājya is an 'Arthavāda' meant only to eulogise the importance of Atma-jñāna or is meant for those who are not fit to undergo the difficult path of karma. For, the sannyāsa is recommended for achieving and stabilizing the Ātma-jñāna which one has realized, and for preventing the karma to contaminate him in any way. As the Upaniṣads describe the Ātman as 'not this, not this', He cannot be grasped by hands, cannot be destroyed, cannot be said to have any contact with any other thing, and so, cannot be bound or afflicted. One

who realizes Him thus can have no occasion for repenting that he has committed a sin, or for being joyful by doing meritorious deeds. He goes beyond both pāpa and puṇya whether they be of his present or previous life; nor is he afflicted if his daily routine is half-done or not done at all. For, the fire of the knowledge of the Ātman, as the Bhagavadgītā says (4.37) burns to ashes all his accumulated and future (sañcita and Kriyamāṇa) actions. Therefore, just as a man whose eyesight is not impaired does not deliberately jump into the thorns or into a well during day-time, even so the jñānin does not go by the path of karma. As the fruits of all other actions are involved in the fruit of the Brahmajñāna, there is no necessity to do any kind of karma for one who wishes to realize the Brahman. If honey can be had from the tree known as 'Arka' why should one go over a mountain to collect it? 'O Arjuna', says the Bhagavadgītā, 'all the actions and their fruits are involved in the knowledge of the Ātman', (4.23). Or, as is said in this very Upaniṣad, 'all the beings live on the support of a fraction of the bliss of Brahman' (4.3.32). In short, the realizer of the Brahman has nothing to do with karma. 22

129. *The realized person sees everywhere nothing but the presence of the Ātman*

The ṛcā (mantra in kaṇḍikā 23) tells us again that the Ātman being incapable of being modified or affected in any way, the greatness of the realizer of the Ātman (Brahman) also lasts forever. For him, both dharma and adharma (pāpa and puṇya) are forms of pāpa only, inasmuch as dharma or puṇya also becomes the cause of bondage only. Calm and quiet does he become by the cessation of the activities of the senses. Relieved from the various mental cravings, free from all desires regarding progeny, wealth and popularity, forbearing all sorts of duals such as heat and cold, he becomes well-lodged in the Brahman, heart and soul. Everywhere he sees the Ātman only and not even a blade of grass without the presence of the Ātman. Transcending all the three states of wakefulness, sleep, and dream, he remains engrossed in contemplation, and on that account attains the status of a sage (muni). Beyond doubt, beyond desire, and beyond sin as he goes, he alone can be said to be a real Brāhmaṇa

though he might have been so by birth and called as a Brahmin by courtesy. In view of this all, Yājñavalkya told Janaka that he had attained the Brahmaloṇa, and he was therefore, without any fear. At this Janaka said, 'I place before you the whole of my kingdom, the country of Videha, as well as myself for your service, O Yājñavalkya'. Here ends the inquiry into Brahmavidyā along with the nature of Sannyāsa. This is the *summum bonum* of human life, the ultimate destiny and the high watermark of spiritual Good, and the teaching of all the Vedas, realizing which a Brahmin becomes blessed indeed. 23

Verily, it is this Ātman, the subject-matter of the conversation between Janaka and Yājñavalkya, who being immanent in all, is the giver of wealth, food and the fruits of all the actions of man. One who knows this and worships the Ātman obtains food, wealth and cattle. Even so, one who realizes that the Ātman is without fear, old age and death, becomes himself so. As fear is the result of avidyā, fearlessness is that of Vidyā. Thus, it has been explained by this Brāhmaṇa of the Upaniṣad how all the dualistic descriptions of creation, existence and dissolution of the universe, and of actions, instruments and fruits are only superimpositions of the avidyā on the nature of the Ātman. All this, however, is explained in the manner in which the knowledge of numbers from one to million and beyond is made available by means of a line standing either in the place of the unit or that of the tenth or hundredth place, or in the manner in which the knowledge of the alphabet is made known by means of paper, ink, and lines. When the knowledge of numbers or alphabet is attained, the lines, the paper and ink will have finished their purpose. Even so the dualistic and the pluralistic conceptions regarding the origination and dissolution of the world, as also about karma and things in general will cease to have any meaning, after they are used as means to establish the only one Reality of the Brahman. 24-25

(Here ends the fourth Brāhmaṇa of the fourth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad).

ADHYAYA FOURTH : BRAHMAṆA FIFTH

The Upaniṣad has narrated so far that the realization of the Ātman who is described negatively as 'not this, not this', and who is independent of all sorts of Karma, is the only means of attaining immortality, and that complete renunciation of all actions is the means of retaining that realization of immortality as a constant possession. Now follows the disquisition regarding the nature and necessity of sannyāsa and its relation to knowledge and karma. This seems to be all the more necessary in view of the great discrepancy between different versions of Śruti and Smṛti passages regarding Jñāna, sannyāsa and karma according to the Varnas and the Āśramas. For instance, we get the passages, 'One should keep the sacrificial fire throughout one's life', 'One should wish to live for a hundred years in order to be able to do actions,' as the guiding principles for a house-holder. Other Śruti passages tell us quite the contrary regarding other āśramas. 'One should know the Ātman by means of the study of the scriptural literature and through the instruction of the spiritual teacher, and leaving the āśrama of the house-holder, he should become a sannyāsin.' There is another Śruti which tells us that there should be a regular order in which one should leave one āśrama and enter into another. 'After finishing the period of celibacy, one should become a house-holder, and then a dweller in the forest, and then, last of all, a sannyāsin'. As opposed to both these passages, we get the passage which allows one to accept sannyāsa, even after the period of celibacy is over. Similar are the passages in Smṛti also; and similar again is seen the contradictory practice even among the knowers of Śrutis and Smṛtis. Naturally, this becomes the cause of bewilderment to those who are less learned and therefore less competent to decide as to which Śruti or Smṛti should be considered as correct. Therefore, it is very necessary to look more closely in this matter and decide the specially important problems of the relation between Jñāna and Karma, and of the place and the function of sannyāsa with reference to them.

The Pūrva-pakṣa holds that the entire import of the Vedic instruction is the injunction to do actions, as is clear from sentences such as, 'One should keep up the sacrificial fire throughout his life'. All the forty saṃskāras beginning with the purificatory

ceremony performed after menstruation to facilitate conception, known as the 'Garbhādhāna' Saṁskāra, to the final funeral saṁskāra, known as Antyeṣṭi' are to be performed by the chanting of the Vedic mantras. Even the corpse is burnt along with the sacrificial utensils, though this is not done in the case of a sannyāsin. His dead body is buried and not burnt. This shows that the Vedic mantras are used for the performance of actions only, and suggests by implication that one who wishes to be inactive is unfit to know the import of Śruti. For instance, as the Śurti tells, 'One who abandons the duty of keeping the sacrificial fire, becomes the enemy of gods'. And, even if it be contended on behalf of the Siddhāntin that there are Śruti passages which recommend renunciation of Karma, and the abandoning of the saṁsāra as a whole, they stick to the opinion of the Pūrvapakṣin, meant for being applied to those who are somehow unfit to do any actions. For instance, the lame and the blind cannot be able to execute the actions properly. So it is with reference to such disabled or unfit persons that Śruti allows them to retire from doing works. Even within the sphere of works, there are two sacrifices known as Viśvajit and Aśvamedha which, if performed, leave nothing for being renounced; for, in them whatever the sacrificer possesses has to be completely given in charity. Naturally, there occurs by way of compulsion the renunciation of all things; and then it appears that there is a sort of order in which the renunciation or sannyāsa should take place. But a little consideration will show that this too occurs in the case of those who have left nothing with them because they have performed one of the two sacrifices.

130. *Karma alone or its combination with knowledge is useful prior to the realization of the Ātma-jñāna*

The Siddhāntin comes forward and asks the opponent if he wants to bring in disrepute the sannyāsa to which a realized person is expected to resort or that to which a person wishing to realize the Brahman is expected to resort. With reference to the first alternative, the Siddhāntin says that right from the beginning of the statement that 'One should worship the Ātman' (Br. 1.4.7) up to the description of the Ātman as 'not this, not this' (4.4.22), the Upaniṣad has convincingly and repeatedly proved that Ātma-jñāna is the only means of being immortal. This means

that there will be no scope for doing any action after one has realized the knowledge of the Ātman. If this is not acceptable to the opponent on account of his holding the view that knowledge combined with Karma is the means of obtaining immortality, let him say why he requires knowledge at all for attaining liberation. And, if in reply he would say that it is because the Upaniṣad itself declares by putting it in the mouth of Yājñavalkya that what he had instructed to his wife, Maitreyī, namely that the Ātma-jñāna is the only means of attaining immortality, he would virtually be accepting that Ātmajñāna is independent of Karma. But that, even the very motive of doing any action is destroyed by Ātma-jñāna is evinced by the fact that the notion of difference between the worshipper and the worshipped which is so essential in a karma like Agnihotra, does not exist during the condition of the realization of the Ātman. No worship of Fire would be possible unless the deity of Fire to whom the offerings are to be made becomes related to the doer (kartā) and the action (karma); unless, in other words, there is a felt difference between the worshipper and the worshipped. But as the Upaniṣad says (Br. 1.4.10) such a person 'cannot realize the Ātman', 'Gods also keep him at a distance, who regards them as different from the Ātman' (Br. 4.5.7.); 'One who sees plurality here moves from death to death' (Br. 4.4.19); 'One should therefore see the Ātman as unalterable' (4.4.20); 'he sees all as the Ātman' (4.4.23). All these passages show that the awareness of all the six relations, namely, Kartā, Karma, Karṇa (instrument), Sampradāna (to whom a thing is given), Apādāna (the thing given), and Adhikaraṇa (the place where it is given) do not exist during the knowledge created by Ātma-vidyā.

The Pūrvapakṣin raises the objection by pointing out that when the selection of a purified place, day-time, scriptural study and the instruction of the teacher, are recommended for worship or meditation, it cannot be said that these are not essential for the emergence of knowledge. The reply is that for the performance of karma which is dependent on some person (Puruṣa-tantra) consideration of place, time and circumstances will, no doubt, be necessary; but as the knowledge of the Ātman is not dependent on any person but is *sui-generis* (Vastu-tantra), that is, depending on the will of the Ātman himself, there is absolutely no need of any consideration of extraneous conditions. Like heat

which is inherent in fire, knowledge is inherent in the Ātman. Hence, what the Ātma-jñāna does is not to cancel altogether the teachings of the Karma-kāṇḍa or the injunctions laid down by it, but it removes the dualistic belief in the distinctions and the differences created by the intellect between the Ātman, on the one hand, and the souls of the individuals and the various objects of desire, on the other. It is quite possible that the desire of a man who wishes to perform a sacrifice for the purpose of attaining heaven might be quelled to a great extent on account of his having achieved even a verbal knowledge of the Ātman, but it will be absurd to say that thereby knowledge about how to perform a particular action would also have no meaning. In fact, before the emergence of the knowledge of the Ātman, the differences and distinctions do act as the motives of desires, actions and the fruits thereof. Till then, the Karma-kāṇḍa is not without meaning or purpose. But, then, there is karma only, and no combination of it is possible with jñāna. Even so, with the rise of the knowledge of the Ātman, there will be no occasion for the performance of works, and so no combination of Jñāna with karma.

131. *Good and benevolent works as well as moral virtues are highly useful for the emergence of Ātma-jñāna*

This then is proved, that Ātma-jñāna is not only independent and unconcerned with Karma, but that it has its opposition also to karma. And if it is the only means of achieving immortality, the acceptance of sannyāsa by one who has realized the Ātman is also proved, without adducing any other reason. Even so, the sannyāsa of one who has merely a verbal knowledge of the Ātman, but who wishes to realize him, is also justified, inasmuch as all karma which is subject to origination, modification, acquisition, or purification occurs as the result of avidyā, and not in the condition of Ātma-jñāna. Naturally, one who wishes to realize the Ātman would be equally expected to renounce all actions excepting those which are necessary for the maintenance of the well-being and protection of the body. The only relation then which can be established between karma and jñāna is that good and benevolent works help to purify the

mind, and so are useful only in an indirect manner for the emergence of the knowledge of the Ātman in that purified mind. Thus, whether we talk about the sannyāsa of one who has realized the Atman (Vidvat-sannyāsa) or about the sannyāsa of one who wishes to realize the Atman (Vividiṣā Sannyāsa), what is common to both, so far as the works are concerned, is that only such works are useful as will either be considered as internal or external means for the emergence of the Ātma-jñāna. For instance, actions like non-injury (ahimsā), non-stealing (asteya), celibacy (Brahmacharya), etc., in which the act of control is predominant, and absence of egoism, unpretentiousness, contemplation, dispassion, knowledge etc., in which the attitude of the mind is chiefly concerned, are highly useful for having Ātma-jñāna. On the contrary, the rules of conduct which govern other āśramas, but which inevitably involve love, hatred and several other sinful acts, are to be avoided by one who wishes to realize the Atman. For, after all, disgust (Vairāgya) for objects other than the Atman is the ultimate test of sannyāsa. The Sāṃkhya and the Yoga also have supported the claim of sannyāsa and Vairāgya as being the internal means of achieving Ātma-jñāna. Therefore, one who is disgusted with the affairs of the world is free to accept sannyāsa even while he is leading the life of a celibate.

132. *Let the counsel of doing works for a hundred years be reserved for the ignorant people*

With the discussion so far it should be clear that karma is meant for those who have desires for all sensuous objects, but has no desire for the realization of the Atman. Even then, the sole motive of doing actions cannot be said to be the desire for living for a period of one hundred years. Manifold are the nature of desire, and manifold are the fruits of action, whether they are the routine, daily duties according to Varṇa and Āśrama, or as ordained specially by the Vedas as being instrumental for the fulfilment of desires. But after all, the karmas including even the Viśvajit and the Āśvamedha sacrifices, as also the body of the doer of them have their end in a heap of ashes, whether the man lives for one hundred years or not. Seeing this destination of man and his works, one who wishes to have liberation should

accept sannyāsa even during celibacy, and go by the way of śravaṇa and manana (meditation) to realize the Ātman. 'Where are all going, one's father and grand-father, and where is he to go?' Thus he should think of the approaching death, and seeing the futility of wealth, wife and relations, enter into the cave of his own understanding, and make the discovery of the Ātman for himself. Let the counsel of doing works for a hundred years be reserved for the ignorant and those who are not authorized to enter into the fold of the Sannyāsins. 15

(Here ends the fifth Brāhmaṇa of the fourth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FOURTH : BRĀHMAṆA SIXTH

This Brāhmaṇa is devoted to mentioning the names of all those who come under the spiritual lineage of Yājñavalkya. Ultimately as all of them are sprung out of the self-existent Brahman; so the author of the Upaniṣad makes a salutation to Brahman.

(Here ends the sixth Brāhmaṇa of the fourth Adhyāya, as also the Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆA FIRST

Perfect, and all-pervading is the Parabrahma. This Brahman, namely, the Brahman as effect and attended by upādhis springs up from the Parabrahma as the cause of it, and is as all-pervading, as its original (cause) is. With the support of Vidyā which enables one to realize the Ātman as identical with Brahman, if one were to subtract the superimpositions of the upādhis of avidyā which arise on account of the contact with all other beings, what would remain is nothing but the original all-pervading Brahman which is one homogeneous, and eternal consciousness.

After having described in the four preceding adhyāyas the nature of the upādhiless Brahman, that is, the Ātman who is

immanent in all beings and who is capable of being directly realized, what follows is known as the 'Khila-kāṇḍa' wherein will be described the various upāsanās (forms of worship) which not being incompatible with Karma, are capable of bestowing both prosperity and gradual release. Therefore, as parts of these upāsanās will also be narrated the nature and effects of the various means, such as the worship of Om, self-control, charity and compassion.

133. *Brahman will be one only in spite of manyness*

First comes for consideration the interpretation of the mantra, 'Om Pūrnam Adaḥ, etc. 'which is translated in the first paragraph above as done by Bhartṛprapañca and his followers. According to them, from the cause which is perfect comes forth the effect which is perfect, and which has continued to be perfect even in the present time, though in a modified, dualistic form. This means that just as at the time of origination, the effect is as perfect as the cause, even so not only does it continue to be perfect so long as it exists, but during its dissolution in the cause it remains in its original perfect condition. Thus, throughout the three conditions of origination, existence and dissolution, that is throughout the past, the present and the future times, the effect and its cause are both perfect. Though the effect and the cause are dual in number, their perfection is one and the same; and so, the Brahman which is both dual and non-dual is one in nature, in spite of the apparent contradiction. Just as waves, foam and bubbles which are produced out of water and dissolved in the water of the sea, are as real as water, because they are constituted by water, even so all this dualistic world, considered from the viewpoint of its original causal condition, is as real as the Parabrahma. If one does not accept this position but holds that the Upaniṣadic portion of the Vedas is alone real, because it states that Reality is non-dual in nature, then obviously, the Karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas which bestows reality on the dualistic aspect of existence will be contradicted and therefore treated as unreal. In order to ward off this eventuality, Śruti has used in the Mantra the two words 'Adaḥ' (that) and 'Idam' (this) as standing for the cause

Parabrahma and the effect (world) and has shown that both of them are equally real.

Untenable, however, is this position, says Śrī Śankarācārya. For, where the subject-matter is some action, both the general rule and an exception to it are possible. For instance, there is general rule that no animal should be killed, but an exception to this is also allowed in the jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice. But, Brahman being non-dual, there cannot be, in the first place, a part of it where the exception can be allowed. Besides, it is wrong to say that the non-dual Brahman comes into being and is dissolved. Similarly, as Brahman does not indicate any action, there can neither be a choice as is possible in doing one or the other action, nor a combination of them. In the Atirātra sacrifice for instance, it depends on the will of the sacrificer whether he should drink or not the Soma juice by means of a pot known as Śodaṣi. But it does not depend on the wish of a man whether Brahman should be dual or non-dual. In fact, Brahman can never be both.

Inconsistent too is the above position with Śruti and reasoning. Otherwise, all the Śruti passages which described the Brahman as of one, homogeneous nature like a piece of salt, as bereft of all external and internal differences and distinctions, as uniform, as neither embodied nor disembodied, as neither gross nor subtle, as devoid of old age, death, fear, etc., shall have to be thrown into the sea as being useless. The position does not stand the test of reasoning also. Things which consist of parts and are likely to be modified by action are said to be transitory. But the constant nature of the Ātman is proved by the fact that he is being recognized as the same even after a long time. To suppose that the Ātman also is transitory would jeopardize the position of the Karma-kāṇḍa also. For, there being no permanent doer of actions, one may get the fruits of actions which are not done by him, or not get the fruits of actions which he might have done. It is better to abandon the Upaniṣads altogether than to say that they must be so interpreted as would be consistent with what is actually perceived in daily life, namely, the manifold nature of things around us, and so to hold the view that the Brahman is both one and many. Śruti does not ask us to know or meditate upon that Brahman which is like a forest of many calamities and distress. On the contrary, it tells us to

know that it is one only as the spiritual preceptor also asks us to believe. One does not require the help of the scriptures in order to know that the world consists of many things. Even a newly born baby begins with the awareness of dualism, but the knowledge that there is no reality attached to the dualistic view does not arise at that time. The Karma-kāṇḍa is valuable so long as there is need for activity. To that extent it gives instructions regarding what should be done and what should not be done. But all this is possible so long as things are viewed with differences and distinctions in them. It is only afterwards and in course of time that man comes to know that unlike the Karma-kāṇḍa which is based on the recognition of instruments, actions and their fruits, the instruction about Brahma-vidyā is given by the preceptor for enabling the disciple to enjoy the blissful condition of liberation (Kaivalya).

134. *One's own experience is the most trustworthy of all*

Once a person is thus established in the concrete realization of his own Form (the Ātman) he ceases to be interested in the trustworthiness even of the scriptural evidence. For him, there arises no problem regarding the opposition between karma and jñāna. For, the distinction and difference between the Śāstra and its instruction, on the one hand, and himself as a disciple, on the other, disappears totally. There can be opposition if anyone of these three remains in his consciousness as a separate entity from the other two. But when all of them merge in one Śiva (the Brahman) there will neither be any awareness of opposition or non-opposition between jñāna and karma. In fact, there will be no difference even between the teacher who instructs the Brahma-vidyā and the disciple, when the latter would have the experience of Brahman. Till this is achieved, there will necessarily be the awareness of opposition even on the hypothesis that the Brahman is dual and non-dual at the same time, or that it consists of parts and is at the same time indivisible and one.

After this introduction to the fifth Adhyāya, the Upaniṣad begins with the mantra, 'Om, Khaṁ (ākāśa) is Brahma', and with its interpretation and significance. In the first place, it has to be remembered that this mantra is not at all subservient to any action, but that it has to be meditated upon. The word

'Brahma' in the mantra means 'great or infinite' without any qualification. But this indefiniteness of the meaning of the word has been modified by the word 'Kham' added on to it as an adjective. The word 'Om', however, which can equally be used in connection with 'Brahma' or 'Kham Brahma', that is with the Brahman as qualified or not qualified by upādhis, indicates that it serves as a great means for meditation (ka. 1.2-17). One should utter Om and concentrating his mind upon the Ātman, meditate upon the highest Puruṣa (Pra. 6.5; Mu. 2.2.6). Whether it is the study of the Vedas or that of the use of the weapons, or the loud singing of sāman, one should utter Om at the beginning and at the end of all activity. Being the closest and the dearest to Brahman, Om is both the symbol and Name of it. So, by the meditation on Om, one is favoured by the grace of the Brahman, and becomes honoured in the Brahmaloḥka (ka. 1.2.17). That eternal (Purāṇam) Brahman which is Ākāśa in the form of Paramātmān, and not the elemental ākāśa, though the son of Kauravyāyaṇi thinks it to be so, cannot be grasped by the senses. Therefore, just as Viṣṇu is said to dwell in the image (Pratimā), known as the 'Śāligrāma' stone, even so the power of the Brahman is brought in Om, if the meditation on Om is carried with faith and devotion. It matters little whether the sādḥaka is interested in worshipping the sopādḥika Brahman or the Nirupādḥika one, the symbol of Om is capable of enabling him to realize either one of them or both (Pra. 5.2). Not only is Om the symbol (Pratīka) of Brahman, it is also its Name, by repeating which Brahman can be realized. And, as the Chāndo-gyopaniṣad says (2.23.4), all the Vedas are pervaded by Om, and it is on that account that it can be called as 'Veda'. So one who knows the significance of Om can be said to have known the significance of all the Vedas.

(Here ends the first Brāhmaṇa of the fifth Adhyāya of
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆA SECOND

135. *Prajāpati's instruction to gods, men and asuras*

Once upon a time the gods, the men, and the demons all

approached their common father, Prajāpati, and observing celibacy, implored him to instruct them as he thought proper. Imparting the letter 'da' to the gods, Prajāpati asked them if they had understood the significance of what he had told them. 'Yes', replied the gods, 'as we have no control over our senses, you have asked us to have it by giving us the suggestion that the letter 'da' stands for 'damana' which means the control of the senses.' 'Right you are', said Prajāpati. Next came the turn of men. To them also Prajāpati gave the instruction by uttering the letter 'da' and asked them if they had understood the meaning of what he had instructed. 'Yes', said the men, and they explained that inasmuch as men are greedy by nature, he wished that they should give some portion of their wealth in charity, as 'da' meant 'datta' (what is given away) as dāna or charity. The demons (Asuras) also took their turn and requested, Prajāpati to instruct them, whereupon the same letter 'da' was given to them by Prajāpati. On being asked if they had understood the meaning of the instruction, the demons told him that inasmuch as they were by nature cruel, he had asked them to be kind to all the beings.

This three fold instruction of Prajāpati as 'da, da, da' which comes to us, as if it is the thundering of the clouds, will be of the utmost value even today. Like gods, man and asuras, men in the present time also would be aware of their defects and so would improve themselves by following the instruction of Prajāpati. Not that the instruction given to gods and asuras is not of any value to men. For we do find among men those who have no self-control, those who become angry and are cruel, and those who are greedy. Even the same person may have all these defects at one time or other. As the Bhagavadgītā says (16.21), Kāma (sensuous desires), Krodha (anger) and Lobha (greed) are the three doors which open into hell, the victory over them as instructed by Prajāpati by the threefold means of self-control, compassion, and charity, should be the goal of every human being. 1-3, 2

(Here ends the second Brāhmaṇa of the fifth Adhyāya of the
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆAS THIRD,
FOURTH AND FIFTH136. *Worship of the heart as the Brahman*

Who is the Prajāpati referred to in the second Brāhmaṇa? It is the intelligence (buddhi) located in the heart of man which is, as narrated at the end of the Śākalya-Brāhmaṇa, the support of all the beings and which sums up everything consisting of names, forms and actions. The all-pervading nature of the 'ṛhdaya' (heart) is the reason why it is known as the Brahman, and why the senses offer their objects as oblations to it, so that the person may be pleased. The first letter namely 'ṛh' of ṛhdaya achieves this much; the second, namely 'da' which means, as before, 'dāna' (charity) implies that one who worships the Brahman as 'da' gets in return prosperity from his own kith and kin as well as from others. And the third letter 'yam' which means 'movement' enables the upāsaka to attain to heaven. 3, 1

The same Rhdya or Brahman is the truth, as well as the five elements, the embodied and the disembodied, the great, revered and the first-born Being. Whoever knows this Brahman gets victory over his enemies. 4, 1

Before origination this world was water in the form of oblations in a sacrifice. After the sacrifice was over, they remained in an unseen subtle manner in the form of not only water but also in the forms of other elements, which were responsible as seeds for the origination of this world of names and forms. They were also the cause of the emergence of Satya Brahman, that is the first born Sūtrātmā or the Hiranyagarbha, from whom was born the Virāt Puruṣa or the Prajāpati who, in his turn, produced the gods and other beings. That Satya Brahman became known as 'Yakṣa', the object of great reverence, because the gods instead of worshipping their father, that is the Virāt began to worship the first-born, Satyabrahma. Therefore, like the Rhdya Brahman, it too is fit for being worshipped. It is named as Satyam and consists of three letters 'sa', 'ti' (ti) and 'yam'. Out of the three letters, the first and the third convey the Truth but the middle one 'ti' conveys falsehood (anṛta) or death (mr̥tyu). But as on both the sides of it, there is truth a casual utterance of falsehood will not destroy the upāsaka, as a deliberate falsehood would do.

137. *The Puruṣa in the eye is the same as the Puruṣa in the Sun*

There is, however, a peculiar mode of worshipping this Satyabrahma, since it is he who has become, so far as his ādhidaivata (celestial) form is concerned, the Puruṣa residing in the Āditya or the Sun, and has also become, so far as his adhyātmika form (as residing in the human body) is concerned, the Puruṣa in the right eye. These two Puruṣas take the support of each other. The Puruṣa in the Sun is said to be present in the eye because he sends his rays and enables the eye to see; while the Puruṣa in the eye is said to be present in the Sun because the sense-organ eye is itself used by him to see the Sun. And, when a man approaches death, the same Puruṣa, who is equally present in the eye and the Sun, withdraws his rays and stays in an unconcerned manner. As a result of this the Vijñānamaya jīva sees the disc of the Sun as bereft of his rays, as if it is the disc of the moon. Thus, it becomes clear that the two Puruṣas are but the two aspects of one and the same Satya Ātman.

Of the Puruṣa in the disc of the Sun, 'Bhūh' is the head, since the letter is one, and the head also is one; 'Bhuvah', which consists of two letters, indicates the two arms; 'Svah' which also consists of two letters indicates the support of two legs. His secret name is 'Ahar', which, according to its root meaning (han to kill) enables a man to destroy his sin, if he would meditate upon that name. Likewise, the Puruṣa in the eye also is endowed with exactly the same limbs indicated by Bhūh, Bhuvah, etc. Here also, one who meditates upon the secret name 'Ahar' becomes free from sin. 5, 1-4

(Here end the third, fourth, and the fifth Brāhmaṇas of the fifth adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆA SIXTH

138. *Brahman as of the size of wheat*

The same Puruṣa is also described as Manomaya, since he is known in the mind and known by the mind. And since mind is the illuminator of all things and since the Brahman or the Ātman is the mind, he is said to illumine all things. He lives in the

innermost portion of the heart and appears to be of the size of the grain of wheat or barley; and so he becomes perceptible to the sight of the Yogins. From there he controls and protects all the beings, since he is the independent Lord of all. By worshipping him as Manomaya the worshipper himself becomes of his nature. 6, 1

(Here ends the sixth Brāhmaṇa of the fifth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆAS SEVENTH, EIGHTH AND NINTH

139. *Brahman to be worshipped as lightning, as Vāk,
Vaiśvānara and Vāyu*

Brahman is said to be the lightning (Vidyut) also; for while manifesting itself it destroys the darkness of the clouds by breaking them. One who knows and worships the Brahman as endowed by this quality of the lightning destroys all the sins which come in the way of the realization of the Ātman. 7, 1

Vāk (word as constituting the three Vedas) is the Brahman, and should be worshipped as a cow having four udders. The milk which comes out of her two udders, namely, Svāhā and Vaṣat, feeds the gods. Men live on the milk coming from the udder known as 'Hanta, while the Fathers live on the milk which comes out of the udder Svadhā. The bull in the form of Prāṇa is responsible for making this cow of Vāk give birth to a calf known as mind. And it is for the sake of this calf of the mind that the cow yields milk; for speech (words) serves the purpose of expressing in language all that of which the mind thinks. 8, 1

The Vaiśvānara fire which lives in the stomach and digests the food is the Brahman. One can hear the sound produced by this fire by closing one's ears, and so worship this fire as Prajāpati. When, however, the soul departs from the body, he does not hear this sound. 9, 1

(Here end the seventh, eighth, and the ninth Brāhmaṇas of the fifth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆAS TENTH AND ELEVENTH

The Puruṣa (soul) which departs from the body becomes one with the wind (Vāyu), which then allows the soul to pass beyond it through a hole in it. The soul which ascends to the region of the Āditya is also allowed by the latter to go beyond him through a hole in him. The soul then reaches the region of the moon, whereupon the moon also allows him to go beyond her through a similar hole in her body. Finally, being bereft of all bodily and mental afflictions the soul reaches the region of the Prajāpati where he lives happily for several years. 10, 1

140. *Contemplation on misery, diseases and death*

One who contemplates that misery due to diseases is a great penance attains to the highest region. It is known as a penance because even before his death he is not afraid to contemplate in advance upon the condition of his dead body, namely, that it would be carried to a lonely place in a jungle and burnt in fire. Thereby, he burns all his sins and attains the highest Loka. 11, 1

(Here end the tenth and the eleventh Brāhmaṇas of the fifth
Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆAS TWELFTH, THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH

141. *Worship of Prāṇa in its different aspects*

Some say that food (Annam) is Brahman; others say that Prāṇa is Brahman. But both are wrong. For, food would be spoiled without prāṇa; and prāṇa would be withered away without food. But when food and prāṇa would combine, they enable one to attain the Brahman. Food gives the support, and prāṇa gives the strength; and even if there be the support of food, no man shall be able to enjoy without strength.

Knowing this one who worships the Brahman would find that all the beings would lean upon him for support, and that all of them will take delight in him. 12,1

142. *Comparison of Gāyatrī and Sāvitrī*

Gāyatrī is one more form of the worship of the Brahman. This is the chief among metres by resorting to which one can protect one's prāṇa and other kinds of wealth and property. The other metres have not got this power. It is the Gāyatrī mantra which makes a Brahmin twice-born (at his upanayana ceremony) and bestows upon him the power to achieve the highest end of human life, namely, the realization of Brahman without being hindered by any obstacle.

Some others belonging to another branch of the Vedic school give the instruction of Sāvitrī in the Anuṣṭubh metre, and not in the Gāyatrī metre. The Anuṣṭubh consists of four quarters, while the Gāyatrī consists of three, though each quarter of both the metres consists of eight syllables, and though the divinity of both is the Sun. The Gāyatrī reads as "Tat Savitūḥ Vareṇyam/bhargo devasya dhīmahi/dhiyo yonāḥ prachodayat." This mantra is made up of twenty-four syllables, and three quarters (feet) each containing 8 syllables.

The Anuṣṭubh Sāvitrī reads as : "Tat Savitur-vṛnimahe/vayam devasya bhojanam/sreṣṭham sarvadhātāmam/turam bhagasya dhīmahi." This mantra consists of 32 syllables and four quarters (feet) each consisting of 8 syllables.

(Here end the Brāhmaṇas twelve to fourteen of the fifth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA FIFTH : BRĀHMAṆA FIFTEENTH

The mantras in this eighth and the last Kaṇḍikā of the fifteenth Brāhmaṇa are the same as the ending mantras of the Īśāvāsyopaniṣad. They constitute the prayer to the Sun-god (Āditya) by a dying person who believes in combining karma with knowledge. As the fourth pāda of Gāyatrī is the Āditya, the prayer is quite appropriate here. As the nature of the Satya Brahman

is covered by the golden lid in the form of lustrous disc of the Sun, and as the Ātman or the Puruṣa in the Sun remains unseen by those whose minds are not composed, it is fervently prayed that the Sun, who is the sole cause of the nourishment of the world, should withdraw the lid of his dazzling rays or make them mild enough for the physical eyes to gaze at him, so that they should visualize the Satya Brahman. The Sun is extolled as the Ātman of the world, and as the Eye by which he sees everything in it. Alone does he travel in the heavens controlling the universe, and maintains the sap, the rays, the prāṇas, and the buddhi.

The dying man knows that the senses and the prāṇa in him are the obstacles which prevent him from being immortal. Therefore he prays to the Fire that after his death the Wind in him should be one with the wind outside; the body be burnt and reduced to ashes and become earth, and that the fire in him, whom he had worshipped as the Vaiśvānara Agni in the stomach, should then remember all that the man might have done during his lifetime, make him free from all sins, and graciously lead him by the right path to prosperity. But being conscious that one cannot do all this at the time of death, he simply says that he makes salutations over salutations as the only form of worship and service possible to him at that time. 15, 8

(Here ends the fifteenth Brāhmaṇa of the fifth Adhyāya, as also the fifth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SIXTH : BRĀHMAṆA FIRST

143. *Dispute among the prāṇas; Chief Prāṇa is the best and the eldest*

That the soul of the Gāyatri consists of the Chief Prāṇa has already been explained. Now it will be explained in this Brāhmaṇa why the Prāṇa is considered as the chief and the best among the other prāṇas (senses). And what was not told earlier in the context of the forms of worship such as Vāktha, Yajuh, Sāma, Kṣatra, etc., will now be told with relation to the upāsanā of Prāṇa.

Prāṇa can be said to be older than the other prāṇas, namely, the senses of speech, etc., because ever since the time of conception what nourishes the foetus is the Prāṇa (Vāyu) and not the senses of the eye, ear, etc. An elderly person need not be the best unless he acquires some virtues; nor is it necessary that the best among men should be the oldest. But as will be shown presently, both the qualities of being elderly and of being the best are present in Prāṇa. Besides, just as the functioning of the prāṇa is alone responsible for nourishing the senses, even so the upāsaka of prāṇa makes the life of the people of his community and that of others also happy, though he may be the youngest of all. (1) Similarly, whatever exists in a prominent manner or whatever eclipses other things is said to be the most important (vasiṣṭha) of all. Vāk (speech) therefore is said to be Vasiṣṭha. It is by means of speech that an orator establishes his supremacy over others and becomes rich. Naturally, by the knowledge of important things, the upāsaka also becomes vasiṣṭha. (2) Even so, the eye is vasiṣṭha, because it is by the help of the eyes that one becomes prominent, whether the place and time are favourable to him or not. (3) In a like manner, the ears can confer upon a man the treasure (sampad) of knowledge that is contained in the Vedas, if only he studies them. He can then become prosperous by doing such actions as are ordained by the Vedas for the fulfilment of desires. (4) Further, one who knows that mind is the support of both the senses and the objects of desires, will know the importance of Bhāvanās (emotions) in getting his desires fulfilled. For, it is according to the force of the mind that the senses move, and that the desires are fulfilled for the sake of the jīva. An upāsaka who knows this all will be the support of other people. (5) And, finally, one who knows the proper use of the genital organs will be endowed with progeny and cattle. 6

In order to decide, however, as to who amongst them was superior to others, all the lower prāṇas who were disputing among themselves approached Prajāpati and requested him to say what he thought about the matter. Prajāpati replied that he among you should be considered as superior to others, if by his departure from the body, people would find that the body has become exceedingly sinful and unfit to live in. (7) Thereupon,

the prāṇas thought to measure their own power and importance. First of all, Vāk left the body, and after living outside for one year returned and asked the other prāṇas how they could live without her. They replied that they were living like dumb persons, but that each of them was doing his own respective function of seeing, hearing, etc. At this the Vāk came to know that it was not the most prominent among the prāṇas, and so quietly entered into the body again. (8) Likewise, the eyes went outside the body and after living outside for one year, returned and asked the other prāṇas as to how they could live without them. 'Just as blind men live, we also lived doing our own duties,' replied the other prāṇas. At this, the eyes also came to know that they were not so important as they thought, and therefore quietly entered into the body again. (9) The ears also left the body, and after living for one year outside returned and asked the other prāṇas as to how they could live without them. 'Just like the deaf, we were living; but we did our duties properly', was the reply. The ears then came to know that they were not of very great importance, and so they too entered again into the body quietly. (10) The mind also came to know that it had no very great importance, since in its absence also for one year, the prāṇas in the body were functioning properly, though they were living in the body without the presence of the mind like ignorant and mad people. Knowing then that it was not of great importance the mind too entered again into the body. (11) Without the semen also, the prāṇas lived and functioned well in the body. Knowing that it is of little importance, the semen also entered again into the body. 12

But no sooner the chief Prāṇa began to depart from the body than the other prāṇas began to drop down from their seats, just as an excellent horse would turn out even the pegs to which his feet are tied, as soon as one tries to ride on him. Being very much frightened, vāk and the other prāṇas (senses) implored the chief Prāṇa not to depart, since they would be unable to live without him. 'If this is so, and if you have come to know that I am superior to you all, bring unto me oblations in token of this,' said the chief Prāṇa. The other prāṇas said in reply, 'yes, we agree.' (13) 'And further,' Vāk said, 'my greatness is your greatness, O Prāṇa'. 'We appear as superior to others because of your superiority', said the eyes. 'My treasure

of knowledge (sampad) is your treasure,' said the ears. 'Not I, but you are the real shelter', said the mind. 'You are the real producer not I', said the semen. In short, 'whatever excellent quality we possess is really the quality of you, O Prāṇa', was the confession of all the other prāṇas; and this confession itself was their homage to the chief Prāṇa. 'What then will be my food and my clothing?' asked the chief Prāṇa. To this the prāṇas replied, 'all food that is eaten over by dogs, insects, flies, etc., belongs to you only. And water is the garment, which can be used for covering'. One who knows this in respect of Prāṇa will therefore receive no censure for having eaten what ought not to be eaten. That is why the Brahmins who have studied the Vedas sip a little water in the beginning and at the end of taking their meals.

An important question arises in this connection. Is it that by eating what ought not to be eaten, the Prāṇa, is not affected, or is it that the upāsaka of Prāṇa also is not affected or censured in any way? Whether the sentence in this 14th Kaṇḍikā, 'there is nothing which does not become the food of the upāsaka of Prāṇa' is to be taken as correct, or whether what another Śruti passage, namely, 'the eaters of what ought not to be eaten become worms' is correct? People who are in favour of the former Śruti passage say that a upāsaka of Prāṇa can eat anything he likes, and explain that the other Śruti passage is applicable to those who are not the upāsakas of Prāṇa. So, from the point of view of such people the two passages are applicable to two different types of people; and as such, there is no difficulty in saying that the two passages can be true at the same time. But this is not correct. For, the words 'food of all the animals' are intended simply to convey the knowledge about a fact, and not as an advice about what should be eaten. Therefore, it does not follow that an upāsaka of Prāṇa should eat whatever he likes. Nor should it be contended that inasmuch as the upāsaka becomes identical with prāṇa, he would be authorized to eat all kinds of food. For, notwithstanding the identity, the upāsaka has a body and senses which would make it impossible for him to eat the food which will be fit only for dogs, insects, and worms. Just as there would be no sense in condemning the redness of a red flower, even so, no censure can touch the chief Prāṇa, if it is said that he is the eater of all kinds of

food. But this can never be said of an upāsaka of Prāṇa, even though he deliberately eats whatever he likes, because, unlike Prāṇa, he has a body and senses. Poison might be the food of worms born in poison, but if that is eaten by other living beings, it will bring death only. Even so, there may be no restriction for Prāṇa, so far as food is concerned; but for a Brahmin who has studied the Vedas and is endowed with body and senses, to eat what ought not to be eaten would only be a sin. So, what is told in the Śruti passage of Kaṇḍikā 14, is only a praise of Prāṇa.

As for the sipping of water before and after the meals, what the Upaniṣad intends to suggest is that one should imagine the water as a piece of cloth used for covering the food that is eaten. One might say that the sipping of water is for the purification of the body; but this does not prevent anyone from supposing that it is also a piece of cloth given to the Prāṇa. 14, 1

(Here ends the first Brāhmaṇa of the sixth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SIXTH : BRĀHMAṆA SECOND

This Brāhmaṇa is intended to give us information regarding the two paths which lead to Pitṛloka and Devaloka (the regions of the Fathers and of the gods) as well as regarding the upāsana known as the 'Pañcāgni-darśana'. It also sums up the entire province of Karma-kāṇḍa, or what is the same thing as the course of saṁsāra.

Once it happened that Śvetaketu, the son of Āruṇi, and the grandson of Aruṇa, went to the court of the King of the Pāñcālās, named as Pravāhaṇa Jaivali. Śvetaketu's intention was to attend the king's assembly of the learned men and to defeat them all in discussion. The King had come to know that the boy was proud of his learning, and so he thought of vanquishing his pride. Therefore, with a somewhat contemptuous tone he said, 'Oh, my lad, have you been instructed by your father?' Śvetaketu could sense the contempt in what the king said, and so, with a bit of anger in his reply, he addressed the king as 'Revered Sir', and said that he was instructed by his father.

Thereupon the king asked him the following six questions. Do you know where exactly the common path, by which the souls depart from the body, bifurcates, and that some go by one path and some by the other? Do you know why the loka (region) to which people reach after death is not filled to its capacity as yet? Do you know which oblation in fire assumes the human form? Do you know what type of karma leads the jīva to Devaloka, and what leads to Pitṛloka? Who are they who reach Devaloka, and who are they who reach Pitṛloka? The two paths are said to be intervening between the two parents. Who then is the Mother, and who, the Father? Śvetaketu replied that he was unable to answer any one of the questions. 1, 2

After having brought down the pride of Śvetaketu, the king requested him to stay with him. But declining the King's hospitality Śvetaketu went straight to his father and complained that he was not taught by him as thoroughly as he was given to believe. He then narrated to his father the questions which the king had asked him and said that he could not give any reply to any one of them. Thereupon, Āruṇi himself went to the King, and though he was properly respected by the latter, he accepted the role of a disciple, without caring to receive anything of the rich presents from him. 3-8

The King then imparted the knowledge of the Vidyā which no Brahmin had known till then.

(Here ends the second Brāhmaṇa of the sixth Adhyāya of the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad.)

ADHYĀYA SIXTH : BRĀHMAṆA THIRD AND FOURTH

These two small Brāhmaṇas are omitted since they contain nothing which is of any philosophical importance.

(Here ends the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad with its six Adhyāyas.)

Retrospect

Before beginning his commentary on this great Upaniṣad Śrī Śankarācārya has written an introduction to it. This Upaniṣad, he says, is of Vājasaneyi Vedic school, just as the Īśāvāsyopaniṣad is the Saṁhitā Upaniṣad of the same school. He calls his commentary as a Vṛtti (gloss) out of humility, though it is a Bhāṣya which first puts in maximum meaning in a few simple words and then explains fully the same meaning, word by word. The entire Veda consists of two parts, known as Karma-kāṇḍa and Jñāna-kāṇḍa, which respectively define the Dharma as Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti (activism and quieticism). The followers of Karma-kāṇḍa are those who wish to have the fulfilment of their various desires; while those who follow the jñāna-kāṇḍa wish to be free from them as they see the hollowness of these desires. A sort of disgust for the whole of saṁsāra extending even up to the region of Brahmadeva, the creator of the world, seizes them because they are thoughtful and have so purified their minds by offering the actions and their fruits to God that they feel the necessity of knowing and realizing the reality, which alone they think would give them eternal joy and peace. It is for such people, says Śrī Śankarācārya, that his Vṛtti would be highly useful. The word, Upaniṣad where the root meaning of the word 'sad' is to destroy the avidyā and where the two prefixes 'upa' and 'ni' suggest that what is contained in the Upaniṣad would lead the seeker very close to the Brahman, can then very well be said to stand for the Brahma-vidyā. Since the Upaniṣad was composed and studied in a forest (araṇya) it is known as Āraṇyaka, and because it is large in volume (bṛhat) it is known as Bṛhad. The one homogeneous indivisible Brahman is its subject-matter, and there are mentioned in it several internal and external means of realizing the Brahman. On this account also, the Upaniṣad has grown in volume. The egoism that 'I am the doer, that all this belongs to me, and that I must be active in order to enjoy the pleasures of life', constitutes, in a word, the whole of the saṁsāra. And, the cause of this all is Avidyā. If anyone wishes to destroy it, he must have the realization of the identity of the jīva (soul) with the Brahman.

What then is the relation of this Upaniṣad with the Karma-

kāṇḍa? Every one has the natural desire that he should be endowed with whatever he wants, and that whatever he does not wish to have should not come to his lot. In achieving this two-fold purpose of human life, the means of knowledge such as perception, inference, etc., are, no doubt, very useful. But what the Veda does is to acquaint us with the means which cannot be found out by any of the commonly known ways of perception, inference, etc. This means that whether it is karma-kāṇḍa, or jñāna-kāṇḍa, the Vedic knowledge, though unlike the empirical knowledge of the worldly affair, is also valid, since it makes us aware of something which would otherwise remain unknown. The proposition, 'the Ātman is this all' is therefore as valid as the proposition, 'one should perform the Agnihotra sacrifice', though both of them cannot be proved to be valid by the ordinary means of knowledge. By its power of making the mind pure, the karma-kāṇḍa is highly serviceable to jñāna-kāṇḍa, though in an indirect manner. The jñāna-kāṇḍa, on the other hand, is directly useful in enabling one to realize the great Aupaniṣadic Puruṣa.

We cannot say that action is the only import of the Veda. For, as Ānandagiri says, 'Veda means Anubhava (direct and immediate experience) analogous to the perception of the ordinary knowledge. But, where the latter fails to give us infallible knowledge of what exists in the heaven, or why as the Mīmāṃsakas hold, the Ātman who is connected with a life beyond death, is to be accepted as a fact, the Veda comes forward and says that these things are absolutely real though there is no evidence to believe so in our empirical life. So far as the Upaniṣadic Vedānta is concerned even this authority of the karma-kāṇḍa need not be taken as the final evidence. For the karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Veda which nourishes the various distinctions of desires, actions, fruits, doers, etc. does not care to root out the avidyā which is the basis of the ignorance of the Ātman, but who is simply assumed for the purpose of the performance of sacrifices and the sojourn of the soul into the heaven. So long as the concrete realization of the Brahman is not achieved all likes and dislikes and sacrificial actions with or without the knowledge of upāsānās, in order to obtain the Pitṛloka or Devaloka will be carried on enthusiastically by man. Nay, not minding the prohibitions of the karma-kāṇḍa, he will

Retrospect

Before beginning his commentary on this great Upaniṣad Śrī Śankarācārya has written an introduction to it. This Upaniṣad, he says, is of Vājasaneyi Vedic school, just as the Īśāvāsyopaniṣad is the Saṁhitā Upaniṣad of the same school. He calls his commentary as a Vṛtti (gloss) out of humility, though it is a Bhāṣya which first puts in maximum meaning in a few simple words and then explains fully the same meaning, word by word. The entire Veda consists of two parts, known as Karma-kāṇḍa and Jñāna-kāṇḍa, which respectively define the Dharma as Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti (activism and quieticism). The followers of Karma-kāṇḍa are those who wish to have the fulfilment of their various desires; while those who follow the jñāna-kāṇḍa wish to be free from them as they see the hollowness of these desires. A sort of disgust for the whole of saṁsāra extending even up to the region of Brahmadeva, the creator of the world, seizes them because they are thoughtful and have so purified their minds by offering the actions and their fruits to God that they feel the necessity of knowing and realizing the reality, which alone they think would give them eternal joy and peace. It is for such people, says Śrī Śankarācārya, that his Vṛtti would be highly useful. The word, Upaniṣad where the root meaning of the word 'sad' is to destroy the avidyā and where the two prefixes 'upa' and 'ni' suggest that what is contained in the Upaniṣad would lead the seeker very close to the Brahman, can then very well be said to stand for the Brahma-vidyā. Since the Upaniṣad was composed and studied in a forest (araṇya) it is known as Āraṇyaka, and because it is large in volume (bṛhat) it is known as Bṛhad. The one homogeneous indivisible Brahman is its subject-matter, and there are mentioned in it several internal and external means of realizing the Brahman. On this account also, the Upaniṣad has grown in volume. The egoism that 'I am the doer, that all this belongs to me, and that I must be active in order to enjoy the pleasures of life', constitutes, in a word, the whole of the saṁsāra. And, the cause of this all is Avidyā. If anyone wishes to destroy it, he must have the realization of the identity of the jiva (soul) with the Brahman.

What then is the relation of this Upaniṣad with the Karma-

kāṇḍa? Every one has the natural desire that he should be endowed with whatever he wants, and that whatever he does not wish to have should not come to his lot. In achieving this two-fold purpose of human life, the means of knowledge such as perception, inference, etc., are, no doubt, very useful. But what the Veda does is to acquaint us with the means which cannot be found out by any of the commonly known ways of perception, inference, etc. This means that whether it is karma-kāṇḍa, or jñāna-kāṇḍa, the Vedic knowledge, though unlike the empirical knowledge of the worldly affair, is also valid, since it makes us aware of something which would otherwise remain unknown. The proposition, 'the Ātman is this all' is therefore as valid as the proposition, one should perform the Agnihotra sacrifice', though both of them cannot be proved to be valid by the ordinary means of knowledge. By its power of making the mind pure, the karma-kāṇḍa is highly serviceable to jñāna-kāṇḍa, though in an indirect manner. The jñāna-kāṇḍa, on the other hand, is directly useful in enabling one to realize the great Aupaniṣadic Puruṣa.

We cannot say that action is the only import of the Veda. For, as Ānandagiri says, 'Veda means Anubhava (direct and immediate experience) analogous to the perception of the ordinary knowledge. But, where the latter fails to give us infallible knowledge of what exists in the heaven, or why as the Mimāṃsakas hold, the Atman who is connected with a life beyond death, is to be accepted as a fact, the Veda comes forward and says that these things are absolutely real though there is no evidence to believe so in our empirical life. So far as the Upaniṣadic Vedānta is concerned even this authority of the karma-kāṇḍa need not be taken as the final evidence. For the karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Veda which nourishes the various distinctions of desires, actions, fruits, doers, etc. does not care to root out the avidyā which is the basis of the ignorance of the Ātman, but who is simply assumed for the purpose of the performance of sacrifices and the sojourn of the soul into the heaven. So long as the concrete realization of the Brahman is not achieved all likes and dislikes and sacrificial actions with or without the knowledge of upāsānās, in order to obtain the Pitṛloka or Devaloka will be carried on enthusiastically by man. Nay, not minding the prohibitions of the karma-kāṇḍa, he will

be engrossed in doing by body, mind, and speech such actions as would ultimately yield for him undesirable fruits and misery. He would not only have the births of beasts and birds thereby but also the births of inanimate objects. In short, this downward destiny which one might have by virtue of his evil action and by the ignorance about the Ātman, cannot be prevented by what is told in the Karma-kāṇḍa alone. In other words, 'the course of this apparently beginningless saṁsāra consisting of names, forms, and actions (nāma, rūpa, and karma) can never be arrested by the knowledge and practice of Dharma and adharma as preached by the Karma-kāṇḍa. The real nature of the world is not what is given to us in manifold forms which recur again and again as continuous water in a stream and so appears as without beginning and end. It has its beginning only in avidyā, and instead of being destroyed will last till avidyā will last. What is then required for its destruction is the Jñāna-kāṇḍa of the Veda, which is in essence, the teaching of this Upaniṣad. Then alone will this saṁsāra which is superimposed on the Ātman as well as the avidyā which is the cause of it will be destroyed.

The introduction being over, Śaṅkarācārya explains that the purpose of the first two Brāhmaṇas of the first adhyāya in which the description of the Aśvamedha is given in detail is to make available for the upāsaka of it the same fruit as would be available to the performer of this sacrifice. Notwithstanding that the Aśvamedha is considered as the best among all actions, and that it is performed by a rare person who has conquered the whole of the country known to him, Śaṅkarācārya points out that it too does not go beyond the domain of saṁsāra. In the first Brāhmaṇa, it is recommended that the dawn (uṣas) and the other divisions of time should be looked upon as the head and other limbs of the horse. The stars, the clouds, etc., are to be considered as the bones, the flesh, etc., of the horse. And the two pots known as 'Mahimā' which represent the two 'grahas' which appear before and after the killing of the horse should be looked upon as day and night. The second Brāhmaṇa tells us how the Agni (fire) came into being. In the beginning, everything was covered by Death who is none else but the desire to eat. He worshipped himself and produced water and earth. Thereby he became fatigued; but the lustre that was produced from him became the Agni. Thereupon Death, who then became known

also as Prajāpati on account of his capacity to produce, got himself divided into three deities, Agni, Sūrya (Sun), and Vāyu. He then wished to have a second body; and with his mind he had already become the dualistic Veda. He then created water, and having entered into it in the form of Karma and Jñāna became pregnant in the form of an egg. Death kept it for one year in the water; therefore he became known as Saṁvatsara (year) Prajāpati. The egg broke, and from it came the first embodied being known as Agni-Prajāpati. Death wished to eat this child, and so opened his mouth. But being naturally afraid on account of avidyā, the child raised the cry uttering the word 'Bhāṇa', which then became known as Vāk. Death then created the entire movable and immovable world out of the union of vāk and mana; but being the devourer of all, he determined to eat each and everything he had created. He became therefore known as 'Aditi'. He then thought of performing a great sacrifice; out of this the fatigue were produced the eyes and the other prāṇas. Imagining himself as the sacrificial horse, he then killed himself after a lapse of one year. Of this Aśvamedha, Saṁvatsara is the soul, Agni is the Arka (Sun) and the three worlds are the limbs of his body. Thus are the Agni, the Sun, and the Aśvamedha one and the same, that is, Death only. One who knows thus conquers death. 1-7, 1

Now, the very first statement of the Śruti in the beginning of the second Brāhmaṇa, namely, that there was nothing before the origination of the world, and that everything was covered by death, raises a very important problem regarding causation. Philosophically considered, a severe battle is fought between the Satkāryavādins and the Asatkārya-vādins, that is between those who say that the effect exists prior to its origination and those who say that it does not so exist, but that it is a new beginning after the cause is destroyed. The Sūnyavādin says that there was nothing but Śūnya (Void) in the beginning; that is there was neither the cause nor the effect. A logician modifies this extreme position and says that the very fact that a jar comes into being means that it had no existence prior to its coming into existence, though one might say that the earth existed as its cause. As against both these views it is pointed out that there was death (as the cause) which as Śruti says had covered all this, suggesting thereby that all this (as the effect) also had exist-

ed as the object to be covered by death. Nothing could have been covered had there been no death to cover it, and there would have been nothing for the death to cover had not there been 'all this'. Thus one can see that both cause and effect are real before and after the origination of anything. The cause continues to exist in the effect; for instance one can even see the particles of earth in a jar which is produced out of it. Therefore, neither the cause nor the effect can be said to be momentary in character. And even supposing they are so, there must be someone who is not momentary in nature, and for whose consciousness both cause and effect are simultaneously present. If the cause finishes its career in one moment, and the effect in another moment, there would be no recognition of a thing of the past moment as being the same in the next moment, unless the two moments happen to belong to one and the same consciousness. Besides, there must be the continuation of the 'that' of the past into the 'this' of the present, and that too not simply by way of similarity but by way of identity.

It should also be remembered that the manifestation of the jar which does exist prior to its origination does not occur because the earth or the wet lump of it is not the only cause which is responsible for manifestation. There are other accessory and efficient causes such as a wheel, a stick, a potter, etc., which are also necessary. And if the existence of the jar, whether of the past or of the future, were not a certainty in the mind of the potter, he would never have taken the trouble of collecting the material and the instruments for the production of a jar. His belief in the existence of a future jar or in that of a jar of the day before is as certain as his belief in the existence of a jar in his present time. In fact, no variety of negation, whether it is non-existence before origination of the jar (*Prāgabhāva*), or one which is after its destruction (*Pradhvansābhāva*), or the reciprocal negation which exists between a piece of cloth and jar (*Anyonābhāva*) or even the absolute negation of the son of a barren woman (*Atyantābhāva*) can be said to have any meaning unless it is first brought in relation with a jar which exists. Therefore, what is proved ultimately is that the jar as an effect exists always in its cause, namely, the earth, and that if the cause were not to exist, there would then never be the effect. The effect, in short, points to its earlier existence in the

form of its cause. In other words, what is proved is that the Satkāryavāda is the only correct view regarding causation. 2

The third Brāhmaṇa, known as the Udgītha Brāhmaṇa is devoted to the description of the upāsana of the chief Prāṇa and its fruits. For this purpose, a parable is told at the outset. Prajāpati has two kinds of progeny, gods and demons. While the gods shone by the lustre of knowledge and works, the demons were immersed in the enjoyment of the sensuous pleasures. But the demons being too many in number they often defeated the gods who then thought out a plan to hurl a crushing defeat on the demons. They requested the Speech (Vāk), the eye, the ear, etc., in succession, to sing the udgītha for them so that by its power they could defeat the demons. But what the demons did each time when one of the prāṇas sang the udgītha, was to penetrate their own sin into that particular prāṇa by having a contact with it. So being pierced by the evil influence, the Vāk and other senses became selfish, abusive, and untrue. The gods thereupon requested the chief Prāṇa to sing for them. And when he began to sing, the demons too tried to play their usual trick of contaminating the Prāṇa by their own sin. But like a clod of earth dashing against a rock, they were thrown back and scattered into pieces. The chief Prāṇa was thus proved to be pure and independent. Besides, he was found to be the essence of the entire body, since a little damage to Prāṇa meant the withering away of the other members of the body. Therefore, the worshipper of Prāṇa as the Ātman obtains the twofold fruit of freedom from sin and death and the attainment of Divinity. His senses too like speech, eyes, etc., will begin to shine with divine lustre inasmuch as they too will be free from sin. Prāṇa also is so magnanimous that he allowed all the senses to enter into him for sharing with him the food he eats, and raised them to the dignity of deities. Therefore the upāsaka of Prāṇa becomes also the giver of food to all. Prāṇa is the Ātman of the three Vedas, since he is the Lord of Vāk, of all that is nameable, and of rūpa, kāma, and karma. Sāma in the sense of sound arises out of Prāṇa; and in the sense of equality is present in all beings as Prāṇa. He is also the udgītha, since the prefix 'U' suggests that he upholds the world by its power, and 'gītha' means Vāk, including the melody (svara) of the song.

Incidentally in this Brāhmaṇa, it has also been shown that

jñāna is not subservient to action, and so, statements about jñāna cannot be said to be 'arthavāda', that is useful for praise or censure. On the contrary, even the import of prohibitory action is not activity, but only the knowledge about what is not to be done. Knowledge of sentences like 'Tat Tvam Asi' have not the power to exclude all kinds of actions, just as knowledge about a mirage prevents us from running with the hope that there is water. 3

The fourth Brāhmaṇa is devoted to describe the power and freedom of Prajāpati in his activities of creating, protecting, and dissolving the universe and to narrate how great prosperity would be available by following the Vedic way of karma and jñāna. With all this, however, the karma-kāṇḍa portion deals with saṁsāra only, though it might be useful to Brahma-vidyā, by creating in man disgust (vairāgya) for all worldly objects of desire. As there was nothing before Prajāpati, and as he came to know of this, he could only utter the word 'Aham' (I) which then became the Name for meditating upon as the upāsanā or Prajāpati. His other Name is Puruṣa, since he could burn all his sins by means of his Vedic knowledge and karma. The Upaniṣad tells us, however, that even this great Prajāpati feared, since he was conscious that he had a body with hands, feet, and senses and that he had identified himself with it. But when the knowledge of the Ātman dawned upon him, the fear in him which was due to avidyā, that is, to his ignorance of the Ātman vanished. Another reason, besides the fear due to which the life and eminence of Prajāpati come under the domain of saṁsāra, is that his desire for meeting a woman had remained unfulfilled, and so he created from his own body a woman known as Śatarūpā and had sexual intercourse with her, as often as she got herself transformed into a cow, a she-goat, etc. It will be idle to discuss whether this Prajāpati or Hiranyagarbha is the same as the Paramātman, or is subject to birth and death; it will be sufficient to note that any jīva, whether it is of the ordinary person or of the Hiranyagarbha, is identical with Paramātman, if he is not in any way affected by upādhis. Therefore it is said that the seed of this tree of saṁsāra is karma and avidyā; its root is Brahman, and its branches, the Hiranyagarbha and others.

Necessarily then, the eternal Brahman is altogether different from the Prajāpati and his creation of all the names and forms of

gods, men and other animate and inanimate objects, though it is said that the Brahman has entered into the created objects. Though immanent in all, he is still transcendent. His entrance then is just like the reflection of the Sun in water. Attributes like pain, etc., appear to belong to the Ātman on account of their being reflected in Buddhi and therefore being superimposed on the Ātman, who has no kind of contact with anything else. Statements about the entrance of the Ātman and about creation should only be taken as ancillary to the statement of the central topic, namely, that the Ātma-jñāna is the chief end of human life. When, for instance, it is told that the Ātman has entered into the body up to the very tips of the nails, just as the razor occupies the razor case or as the fire is immanent in the wood, what is intended to be conveyed is that one should realize that this is so as a matter of direct experience.

One might contend that as there is no difference between jñāna and upāsana, and as the latter being a mental activity would require certain rules for its guidance, and so the knowledge of the Ātman also can be said to be amenable to some kind of injunction. In order that a man should be inclined to have the knowledge of the Ātman, there would be nothing wrong if he is persuaded to follow certain rules about spiritual discipline. Besides, there appears to be a close affinity between injunctions regarding sacrificial activity and those pertaining to the upāsana of the Ātman. For instance, the statements 'the Ātman should be seen,' etc., O Maitreyī, compares well with the statement. 'One who wishes to attain heaven should perform a sacrifice'. The reply is that this contention is wrong. The recommendation to see the Ātman does not carry any advice to practise some other action as is done by a Vidhi-vākya (a statement regarding what ought to be done). A Vidhi-vākya contains in it both the knowledge of the vākya (sentence) and of the activity to be done, while the statement regarding the knowledge of the Ātman does not lead us beyond that knowledge to some sort of other activity. Therefore it is that the 'sopādhika' (conditional) knowledge is not able to cancel the knowledge created by make-believe; while the knowledge regarding the nirupādhika Brahman is capable of sublating all false and illusory knowledge, and is therefore capable of arresting the activity of man to that extent. Nothing except the knowledge of the Ātman is required to get oneself

liberated. Even the stoppage of the Vṛttis of the citta (states of mind) and of desires as recommended by the Pātañjala Yoga depends upon the constant flow of the consciousness that one is non-different from the Brahman. As the statements regarding the Ātman tell us about the Reality which is already accomplished, and not about something which is to be accomplished, their validity also lies within themselves (svataḥ prāmānya), and the test of that validity can be experienced directly and on this side of death, and not, as in the karma-kāṇḍa, after death in some remote future and in a far-off region like the heaven. The realizer of the Ātman does not care to have the transitory gain of ascending into the heaven or for being famous and prosperous in this world. No doubt, he tries to cultivate the virtues of faith in the Guru, self-control, celibacy, vairāgya, and renunciation; but this he does to counteract the force of his Prārabdha karma, so that he should never lose the sight of the Ātman.

Ordinarily, progeny and wealth are dear to man, and so are the body, senses, and the prāṇa. But these are all external to the being of man and so perishable in nature. What is innermost and really identical with his being is the Ātman, who therefore ought to be felt by man as the dearest to him. The word Ātman does neither mean the jiva nor the Hiranyagarbha. It means the Brahman who has entered into the bodies of all. The 'I' or the Ātman can therefore never be interpreted as the saṃsārī jiva. He is the Seer of the sight, the transcendental spectator of all the activities, the Jñāna incarnate. He is not the empirical seer of things like jars and is not modified by any upādhis. He is the eternal seer of himself. Hence, the Śruti says that the sight of this Seer is never lost, just as the heat of fire can never be lost. Hence, there will be no difference between the realization of Vāmadeva of the olden times and that of any man in the present time; and that none will have any power to prevent a man from realizing the Brahman. In fact, as there would be no interval between the realization of Brahman and the knowledge of it, there would be no opportunity even for gods to bring any obstacle. The moment the lamp of Brahma-vidyā is lighted, the darkness of avidyā will vanish altogether. Besides, as the knower of Brahman becomes the Self of all including the gods, whom then will they be able to obstruct? He will be the ideal

for the gods to emulate, and the object for their contemplation. In spite of this, if they try to create any trouble, they would utterly fail.

A caution must, however, be observed by one who tries to realize the Brahman. As realization is a continuous process, a chain of blessed moments, and not simply an event, there ought to remain the continuous experience of 'I am the Brahman'. There need not therefore be the immediate fall of the body; for though the Prārabdha (that karma which has begun to fructify) can never arrest the emergence or the growth of Ātma-jñāna, it has to be exhausted during the life-time of a man. Brahma-vidyā has the power to put a stop to the Sañcita (accumulated) karma, though it does not cancel the Prārabdha. But, even then, there cannot remain any false or illusory knowledge. For, once the rope is seen as rope, there will be no more illusion of a serpent, though on occasions, memory might bring back the dread of the serpent. Similarly, the realizer of the Brahman need not be cowed down by the thought that he has to pay off the debts of gods, fathers, and men. Gods may not like that a mortal being should rise above them to the status of Brahman. But if a man takes care to lead a virtuous and devotional life, it will be enough to please the gods and win their favour.

The fifth Brāhmaṇa tells us in the context of avidyā that the upāsana which makes the distinction between the worshipper and the worshipped is also the effect of avidyā. Here, every being is the creator of his own world of avidyā as also the effect of it, and so the Prajāpati alone need not be considered as the creator of all. Every jiva as also the rest of the world should be considered as reciprocally the cause and effect of each other, on account of the knowledge and karma done by every one of them. Then comes the discussion about seven kinds of food. Regarding the common food which is eaten by all, one should remember that one who eats without giving it first to others is a thief, and that what he himself eats is nothing but sin. The two kinds of food which are offered to gods are the 'huta' (offered in fire), and the 'prahuta' (what is offered as oblations) but not put in fire. Milk is the food of the beasts as well as of men. The three remaining foods are mind, speech and prāṇa, considered in their adhyātmika, adhibhautika, and adhidaivika aspects. The peculiar feature of prāṇa, as the offspring of Vāk (speech) and Manas

(mind) is that it has no rival, and as it occupies the entire body, it is active throughout and always. These three foods constitute the Prajāpati, who then is known as Samvatsara Prajāpati or Kālātmā. Śruti is clear on the point that the threefold food is the fruit of the threefold means which are progeny, karma and aparā-vidyā, and which cause the obtainment of the three worlds, namely, this world of the mortals, that of the fathers, and that of the gods. But neither these means nor the three foods are capable of bestowing liberation. Vāk, for instance, began to insist that it will continue to speak unceasingly. And so did the other senses also. But soon all of them became fatigued; death seized them all and prevented them all from doing their respective functions. Prāṇa and the Vāyu (wind) alone could not come under the influence of death. Those who become the rivals of Prāṇa die a miserable death. Therefore what one should do is to cease to take interest in the workings of the senses, and try to be always in the company of Vāyu and prāṇa, and continue to do so till death, so that he would gradually and approximately be assimilated with them and become ultimately identified with them.

With all the eulogy done so far of the chief Prāṇa, what the sixth Brāhmaṇa tells us is that all this manifested visible world including the glorious achievement of being identified with Prāṇa is infected with avidyā. For the triad of nāma, rūpa, and karma, which constitutes the saṁsāra, and which is necessarily connected with the senses and the body, is further connected with food, mind, and prāṇa which are the constituents of the body. What exists therefore as connected with the body, namely, all the phenomenal existence of nāma, rūpa, and karma is supported by prāṇa. But it is this Prāṇa which is also anātman in nature but which being very subtle is not so discerned, on account of its being covered by the body, that is by nāma, rūpa, and karma. How can then Ātman who is the subtlest of all be directly seen when he is covered by this anātmika prāṇa? Therefore, the next three adhyāyas are intended to make clear the nature of the Ātman.

Adhyāya : II

The Ātman is extremely subtle and difficult to be realized except

by those whose intellect is sharp and whose mind is pure. Besides, he will be realized only through a spiritual teacher. In order to impress this on the mind, the Brāhmaṇa introduces a dialogue between a Brahmin by name, Gārgya, who was proud and professed to know the Brahma-vidyā and a king, named Ajātaśatru, who had realized the Ātman. Gārgya volunteered to impart the knowledge and told Ajātaśatru one after another that he worshipped the Puruṣa in the Sun, the moon, the lightning, the sky, the vāyu, the fire, the water, the mirror, the sound, the quarters, the darkness, and the Prajāpati. Each time, Ajātaśatru asked Gārgya not to talk about that particular Puruṣa, inasmuch as he himself had worshipped that deity and had received the fruit of it in return. Seeing that Gārgya had no further claim to make, and that he had hung down his face with shame, Ajātaśatru started to teach him by approaching a man who was sleeping. He called him by several names, but he did not wake up. Ajātaśatru then moved him by his hand and woke him up, showing thereby that though unlike the senses, the prāṇa of the sleeping man was active during sleep, he could not hear the calls. Isolating thus the active Prāṇa from the inactive senses during sleep, Ajātaśatru convinced Gārgya that the Prāṇa whom the latter was supposing as Brahman was not at all the bhoktā (enjoyer). This means that Prāṇa lacks consciousness; and as such, there would be no meaning in worshipping Prāṇa. And as all other divinities, like spokes fixed in the nave of a wheel, are included in Prāṇa, there would also be no meaning in worshipping anyone of them. The various kinds of Brahman which were pointed out by Gārgya were nothing but, each of them, sopādhika Brahman, that is, one which on account of avidyā, was superimposed on account of nāma, rūpa, karma, and phala on the Ātman. All this constitutes saṁsāra, and so none of them is real.

Thus, after having stated that the Ātman is different from both the body and the prāṇa, Ajātaśatru asked Gārgya as to where the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa was dwelling before being awakened, and from where he had come back again. Gārgya being unable to answer the two questions, Ajātaśatru himself told him that the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa, that is the Ātman, as conditioned by the upādhis of name and buddhi of avidyā, was sleeping in his own uncontaminated condition of pure consciousness,

which is nothing but the nirupādhika Ātman, the Seer of the sight and one who is altogether different from both the dreaming and the wakeful consciousness. Thus, not only is the Vijñānamaya Ātman located in the Paramātman, but the prāṇas also emanate from Him, just as sparks emanate from fire, or a thread emanates from a spider. But it will be futile to argue that though the Vijñānamaya of the waking life is saṁsārī, he would become non-saṁsārī the moment he goes to sleep. A bull does not change into a horse during sleep; even so the properties of a substance do not change though time and place may change. The illustration of the sparks and the fire is not intended to prove the emanation theory about the jivas or the Vijñānamaya from the Paramātman but to show the non-difference of the jivas and of the Vijñānamaya from the Brahman. Like the prince who was reared up by a hunter, and who therefore out of ignorance took up the profession of hunting, became suddenly aware when he was told that he was a prince and not a hunter, even so the Vijñānātmā who gets himself engaged in the affairs of saṁsāra and thinks that he is happy or miserable, weak or strong, under the influence of avidyā, comes to know, when he is instructed by the Spiritual Teacher that he is none else but Brahman. In short, as the wise come to know, the real kartā and bhoktā is not the jiva but the Brahman, though the Brahman neither does nor enjoys anything but simply appears to be doing so.

If the Paramātman alone is real, and if the jivas including the Vijñānātmā are unreal, then for whom is the advice regarding the karma-kāṇḍa and jñāna-kāṇḍa meant? If the Brahman is already liberated, and if everything else is unreal, there will be no other person who should be liberated. Therefore, one may say that not only is the upaniṣadic teaching self-defeating, but it is also fault-finding with reference to karma-kāṇḍa, and in direct opposition to the generally acknowledged means of valid knowledge such as perception and inference. But it is wrong to argue like this, when the direct and the concrete fruit of the upaniṣadic instruction is the realization of the oneness of Brahman, and the consequent removal of grief, infatuation, etc. It does allow full scope for the self-validity of the assertions of the Karma-kāṇḍa also; but these will be of no avail in enabling one to know the oneness of Brahman. So long as one means by 'Vidyā' all that concerns with the divinities and the material which can be offer-

ed to them for winning their favour, even the most learned would be considered as fit for the study and practice of Karma-kāṇḍa. But if by Vidyā we are to understand the knowledge of Brahman as the only Reality, then whosoever wishes to have it shall have necessarily to give up the Karma-kāṇḍa as of no use to him. Till then, it has to be accepted that the Karma-kāṇḍa is useful to the ignorant who are immersed in the desires and pleasures of the worldly life. The scriptures are useful in giving us instruction only just as the light of a lamp shows us certain objects. They leave the man free to act as he likes, and remain indifferent to what is being chosen. Prajāpati gave the same instruction, namely, the letter 'da' to the gods, to the men and to the demons. But the gods thought that 'da' meant self-control; men thought that it meant charity; and the demons thought it meant 'compassion'. If by the oneness of ākāśa the perceptual differences of the five senses are not affected, why should anyone complain that the oneness of the knowledge of Brahman contradicts the sensuous perceptions? They do not understand that the differences are all due to the upādhis of the bodies, the senses, and the mind of these very complainants, that is due to the upādhis of nāma, rūpa and karma. So, how can these kings of flatterers and logicians know what is obtained by the grace of the great spiritual teachers?

The purport of the second Brāhmaṇa is to tell us that the Chief Prāṇa takes its shelter in the body, or in the head in which are also situated the seven Prāṇas (senses), namely, the two eyes, two ears, two nostrils and one mouth. The head is spoken of as an inverted sacrificial pot, known as 'Camasa', in which the Soma juice is kept. It has its bottom upside and its hole (mouth) downwards; and the seven senses or the Prāṇas are then known as the seven great sages such as Gotama, Bhāradvāja, Vasiṣṭha and others.

According to some, as the third Brāhmaṇa tells us, there are two forms of Brahman. The Mūrta or the differentiated Brahman consists of Earth, Water and Fire; and the undifferentiated one of Wind, and Ākāśa. Of the former, there are three visible forms—the dark, the white, and the brown, and they have been produced in the three elements by the power of the Sun. Hence, the disc of the Sun which is manifest (Mūrta) and is burning, is considered as the real essence of the threefold mortal existence.

Of the immortal, unmanifest Brahman also, the essence exists in the Sun; but it is not in the visible disc, but in the causal Puruṣa known as the Hiraṇyagarbha or Prāṇa who resides in that disc. As all the five elements are jaḍa, the rasa in all of them, in spite of the word 'Puruṣa' is jaḍa only. Regarding the adhyātmika aspect, the essence of the first three elements is the eye where the fire manifests in the form of lustre. Here also the Puruṣa, as the rasa of the two unmanifest elements of wind and ākāśa resides in the right eye. Now some of the forms which the Puruṣa (Hiraṇyagarbha) assumes are like the forms of Māyā: a yellow garment, a red beetle, a flame of fire, a white lotus, or lightning. These cannot be attributed to the unchangeable Ātman. Otherwise, there will be scope not only for the sāmkhya, the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas, but also for the Buddhistic nihilists to push their view regarding the Ātman. For instance, following Bhartṛprapañca, if the Vijñānamaya is to be believed as occupying only a portion of the Paramātman, it follows that the latter consists of parts and divisions and is beset with the desire of enjoying the fruits of actions. If there are no divisions in the Brahman such as, nāma, rūpa, karma, jāti, and guṇa, the only way to describe it would be the negative one; namely, 'not this, not this'. And Avidyā being the opposite of the Ātman cannot be believed to have arisen out of the Ātman.

That is why, as the fourth Brāhmaṇa says, when all the karma connected with wife, progeny, wealth, etc., is discarded as being the subject-matter of avidyā, the sannyāsa or the renunciation of actions is recommended as the adjunct of the Brahma-vidyā. Hence, without the least support of any other means, the Brahma-vidyā can bear its own independent fruit of immortality. And so, the renunciation of all other works and means becomes only a preparation for being fit to realize the Brahman. It affords ample opportunities for doing Śravaṇa and Manana. Then the duties of the castes and the āśramas shall have no meaning with reference to him who renounces the world for the sake of achieving the Brahma-vidyā. It will only be, by way of courtesy we may say, that wife, progeny, etc., are dear to us. In fact, what is and what ought to be the dearest of all is the Ātman only. One should therefore listen to what one's spiritual teacher would tell one about the Ātman, and then seeing directly the Ātman should meditate and contemplate always upon it. Otherwise there

might creep in a number of obstacles between śravaṇa and contemplation (gazing) on the Ātman. To realize the Ātman is to have the knowledge of everything else born out of it. Even the Vedas are the breaths of that great Being. Similarly, the knower of the Brahma-vidyā has not to wait till the natural dissolution of the world takes place. He brings it about consciously and that too once for all, like the deliberate dissolution of a piece of salt in water, every drop of which then tastes salty. Once a person becomes one with Brahman, no mark of his tiny individuality will remain separately. The various upādhis and the cause of them, namely, the avidyā will be destroyed, just as along with the destruction of water, the reflection of the moon in it as also the reflected light will be destroyed. What will remain is the moon in the sky. Even so, what will remain after the fall of the body of a realized soul, is neither his little individuality, nor his consciousness of body, senses, and social status, but the one eternal consciousness of Brahman.

The fifth Brāhmaṇa is devoted to explain what is known as the Madhu-vidyā. Just as a bee-hive (Madhu) is prepared by many bees, even so this earth is the workmanship of innumerable beings. Reciprocally, all the beings are a bee-hive produced out of this earth. There are two more Madhus, the physical, human body, and the resplendent, immortal conscious Puruṣa within this bodily frame. These four constitute the Madhu, as brought about by all the beings; and, reciprocally, all the beings are the Madhu of these four. What all this means is that this world consisting of all things owes its existence to a single cause, namely, the Brahman. Therefore, water, fire, wind, Sun, quarters, and the moon are the Madhu of all beings and vice versa. Similarly, again, the prāṇas, the lightning, the rain, the ākāśa, dharma and satya are the Madhu of all beings and vice versa. Finally, this very Ātman who lives in all beings is the Madhu to them all, and all the beings are the Madhu to him. And this Ātman is none else but the realizer of the Brahman; for, it is he who in spite of his bodily form and of his being the Vijñānamaya enters into the Parabrahma, and so becomes the self and the over-lord of all. In him are fixed, like the spokes of a wheel between the hub and the rim, all the worlds, the prāṇas, the souls; that is why the sage Vāmadeva could realize that he was Manu and the Sun. Thus it is that the

Brahma-vidyā (Madhu-vidyā) makes and ought to make all of us dear to one another, just as Maitreyi became all the more dear to her husband, Yājñavalkya on account of her attachment to Brahma-vidyā.

In praise of this Brahma-vidyā, a parable tells us how Aśvinikūmārs, the twin physicians of the gods, approached a Brahmin, Dadhyāṅga Atharvaṇa by name, and requested him to instruct the secret of the Madhu-vidyā which he had learnt from Indra, how being told that his head would be cut off by Indra the moment he imparted that secret to them, how they cut off his head and mounted upon his body the head of a horse, and how the Madhu-vidyā was imparted, how the horse's head was cut off, and how again the original head of Dadhyāṅga was put in its place, but how with all this cruel and sinful act, the Aśvinikūmārs did not suffer even by the loss of a hair on their body. Therefore, the sage who had seen the mantras says that the highest God created not only the innumerable forms but also became a prototype of each one of them. That is why a quadruped begets a quadruped and a biped begets a biped. The main purpose of this re-duplication is to show that no form is there which does not exhibit that its prototype is the Ātman. It is the names and forms which make us aware that the Ātman must be quite different from this sensible world of evanescent names and forms of avidyā. In short, the self-existing Ātman appears as twofold in his own eternal nirupādhika aspect, as also endowed with upādhis which being imaginary do not affect his nature in the least. 5

The sixth Brāhmaṇa enumerates a long list of teachers and disciples.

Adhyāya : III

Now begins the Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa which will fully justify what was already told in the Madhu-kāṇḍa. We shall now know what passed in the court of Janaka and thereby learn that a good deal of service of the spiritual teacher has to be done in order to realize the Brahman. Janaka performed a great sacrifice, but wishing to know who of the huge assemblage of Brahmins in the sacrificial maṇḍapa (hall) had realized the Brahman, he announced that anyone who considers himself lodged in Brahman

should carry away the thousand cows to the horns of each one of which he had tied twenty coins of gold. None dared to do so except Yājñavalkya. Calling his disciple Somaśravā, he ordered him to take the cows away. Thereupon, Aśvala, the priest of Janaka, challenged Yājñavalkya with a bit of contempt to answer his questions if he was the knower of Brahman at all. 'By what means does the performer of a sacrifice (Yajamāna) go beyond death?' was his first question. It is by means of Hotā, fire, and speech, replied Yājñavalkya. Thereby he intended to show that as the priest and the speech are perpetually pervaded by death in the form of karma on account of avidyā, they would become the means of freedom also, if the Yajmāna sees them as forms of fire. 'How can the Yajamāna go beyond Kāla (time) which also is death?' was the second question of Aśvala. 'It is by the means of Adhvaryu (the chief priest) the eye and the Sun', replied Yājñavalkya. Thereby he intended to show that the moment the Yajamāna looks upon his own eye and the chief Priest as the forms of the shining Sun, he becomes free from death, in the sense that like the Sun with whom he gets himself identified, he will have no distinction between day and night as well as between the 'tithis' (the numbering of days) caused by the moon. In other words, what Yājñavalkya meant was that the sacrificer would go beyond the sense of time. Again did Aśvala ask, 'By what means does the Yajamāna attain the Svarga which is there without any support?' If the Yajamāna sees the Brahmā (one of the four priests in a sacrifice) and the mind as forms of the Moon, he would attain to Svarga, was the reply of Yājñavalkya. One more question which Aśvala asked was, 'How many Śastra-hymns will the Hotā speak out in the sacrifice?' 'Three from Rgveda before the sacrifice is begun; three known as Yājyā during the sacrifice, and three others known as Śasyā in praise of sacrifice', replied Yājñavalkya. Thus when all his questions were satisfactorily answered Aśvala became silent.

Aśvala being silenced, Ārtabhāga Jaratkāru came forward and asked Yājñavalkya, 'how many grahas and atigrahas are there?' 'They are eight in number' said Yājñavalkya, and he explained: 'Prāṇa is the graha (that which is overcome by another) and it is being overcome by apāna: for it is the inhaling breath (apāna) and not prāṇa, which can have the capacity to smell. Similarly, speech, tongue, eye, ear, mind, hands, and skin

are the other grahas, and names, essence, forms, sound, desire, actions, and touch are respectively the seven atigrahas (which overcome the grahas). Ārtabhāga asked again, 'What is that divinity which feeds upon death?' 'It is Jñāna, or the realization of Brahman which puts an end to death', replied Yājñavalkya. Ārtabhāga asked again if the prāṇas leave or do not leave the realized person when he dies. Yājñavalkya replied that they do not, and explained that the waves of the sea merge in the sea, but may rise again. What, however, happens at the death of the realized person is that the desires along with the Jivahood merge in their cause, namely, the Brahman, but do not rise again on account of the ignorance being completely destroyed.

Bhartṛprapañca and his followers hold that the realized soul does not become finally released, but resides, somewhere in space, above the region achievable by avidyā and karma. We shall, however, have to determine whether the realized soul about whom we talk is living or dead, and whether he is different or not from the Hiranyagarbha. If he is different as well as dead, how can he continue to practise Śravaṇa, manana and contemplation? And if he is living how can Vidyā (upāsana and karma) which can even confer the status of Hiranyagarbha who, on that very account is none else but a saṁsāri jiva, enable the realized but unreleased soul to turn his back on saṁsāra? How can the cause of motion arrest the motion at the same time?

Then comes again finally a question from Ārtabhāga. 'Where does the Puruṣa retire, when at the time of death, his speech, prāṇas, eyes, mind, ears, body, space in the heart, the hair and the blood and semen merge in fire, wind, sun, moon, quarters, earth, sky, plants and water respectively?' Thinking that it was not desirable to discuss the question in a crowd, Yājñavalkya went with Ārtabhāga to a solitary place and discussed about the matter from various viewpoints such as svabhāva-vāda, and came to the conclusion that Karma it is which renders a man meritorious or sinful, but that Mokṣa is not the result of any cause, and that it is devoid of destruction, names, forms, actions, and their means and fruits.

That Karma has no place in Mokṣa, and that the scope of karma and upāsana is the scope of saṁsāra, including the province of Prajāpati, will therefore be the subject-matter of the third Brāhmaṇa. So far as the Nityakarma (routine duties), for

instance, the Sandhyā-karma of a Brahmin of which no fruit is mentioned is concerned, it need not be said about it that mokṣa is its fruit. And, as there is no fundamental difference between the Nitya and the Naimittika (occasional) actions, and as both of them have reference to the well-being of human life, Mokṣa can not be said to be their result. Like men, owls do not require light for seeing the objects, but does this mean that they hear or taste by their eyes? There is no difference between the eyes of men and those of the owls in their capacity to see. Similarly, though the nitya and the naimittika as also all other kinds of karma are fortified by upāsanā (vidyā), they are attended by fruits which are available only in saṁsāra. So, they would be the cause of bondage; and even if their doers be free from desires, what the actions will be able to achieve for them is sattva-guṇa, or the glory of the gods, but not mokṣa. For, what is required for Ātmajñāna over and above the combination of works and upāsanā is the knowledge of the unity of the Self and the Ātman by means of Śravaṇa, manana and the constant practice of these along with the contemplation on the forms of God. Mokṣa is not only the effect of Jñāna, meaning thereby the realization of Brahman, but also the same as jñāna. It is not a thing to be produced, or modified or moulded; it is one which is already accomplished.

With this in mind Yājñavalkya answered the question of Bhujyu Lāhyāyani that the Pārikṣitas had gone to the region where the earlier Pārikṣitas, that is, the performers of the Aśva-medha sacrifice had gone. That was the region encircled by the Lokāloka mountains, the region of the Virāt Puruṣa where the various karmas begin to bear fruit, and from where the sacrificers are carried on by the sacrificial fire known as Indra and handed over to the invisible Vāyu.

The fourth Brāhmaṇa deals with the question of Uṣasta Cākrāyaṇa as to which of the three Ātmans, namely, the external gross body, the internal subtle body, and the innermost spectator, is the real Ātman. 'He is your own Ātman by which prāṇa, apāna, vyāna and udāna function well, and by which all the movements of the body and the senses are made, but who is different from them all. He is the Vijñānamaya Ātman in you, the inner Self of all.' Explaining this further, Yājñavalkya said that there are two kinds of sight, one is the sight

of the eye, and the other, that of the Ātman. Unlike the former, the latter is neither produced nor destroyed, but it ever exists in its own nature like the heat and light in fire. In fact, when the eye comes in contact with the source of sight, namely the Ātman, we say that the eye sees. And it is owing to the superimposition of this ordinary sight, which is merely a reflection of the source of sight, that there arises the wrong belief that the Ātman sometimes sees and sometimes not. In fact, the sight of the Seer is the Seer himself, and vice versa. The use of the root 'dṛś' (to see) twice in the expression 'dṛṣṭeḥ draṣṭāram' is to make us aware that the ordinary, sensuous perception which involves the distinction of subject and object is altogether different from the non-sensuous sight of the Ātman which is none else but the seer (Ātman) himself.

In the fifth Kahola Brāhmaṇa is described the nature of the Ātmajñāna along with sannyāsa as the means of obtaining freedom from bondage. It will not be correct to say with Bhartṛprapañca that in the fourth Brāhmaṇa Uṣasta wished to know the nature of the Kṣetrajña (jīva), while Kahola here, is anxious to know the nature of the Paramātman. In fact, both Uṣasta and Kahola wished to know one Ātman only, but with two different motives. That the Ātman is different from the body and the senses is the conclusion of the Uṣasta Brāhmaṇa, that he is not the transmigratory soul, and so he goes beyond hunger, thirst, etc., is the conclusion of the Kahola Brāhmaṇa. What is true for both is: look at the names and forms, and there is the saṃsāra and its manyness; look at the substance, for instance, gold or earth and not at the ornaments or the jars, and there is the Paramārtha (Reality) and no appearance of saṃsāra. Either have the manifoldness of saṃsāra as effects, or the unity of the cause, namely, the Brahman. The wise will never accept that during the condition of the realization of the Brahman, the differences and the distinctions of the practical life are real. Therefore the Brahmins of the olden times used to abandon the desires for having progeny, wealth and fame, as also all other kinds of karma, and even the external sign of a Brahmin, namely, the sacred thread (Yajñopavita).

The sannyāsa which is born out of Ātmajñāna is the only genuine sannyāsa and is altogether different from the sannyāsa which is described by the Smritis as the fourth and final stage

(āśrama) of the human life after one has gone through the three earlier stages of Brahmacharya, Gārhaṣṭha, and Vānapraṣṭha. So, it is immaterial for the realizer of Brahman when actually he should enter into the fold of the sannyāsins. For him, the sannyāsa is a very useful adjunct of Ātmajñāna. It helps him to remain permanently fixed in that knowledge by resorting to the means of śravaṇa, manana, etc., and it acts as a check upon the tendency of the mind to be clouded by avidyā and greed. This implies that Vairāgya, though initial, is necessary for the emergence and perfection of Ātmajñāna; and as Ātmajñāna becomes more and more permanent, disgust for other objects (Vairāgya) becomes more and more intense. And then alone there would be the genuine sannyāsa; and then will the sannyāsin who possesses Ātmajñāna and Vairāgya can be called a Brahmin. To ascertain by means of the service of the Guru that Brahman alone is real is Pāṇḍitya (Knowledge); to possess child-like innocence is the Bālyā; to contemplate upon the Brahman is the Mauna (silence of speech); and to experience directly the Brahman is the Brāhmaṇya (the condition of being a Brahmin). The way in which the realizer of Brahman lives can never be determined by any particular standard; but it can never be wayward or immoral. Purity of conduct is an essential condition for the obtainment and continuation of the Brahma-jñāna.

In the sixth Brāhmaṇa, Yājñavalkya answers the several questions put to him by Gārgi Vācakanvi, daughter of Vacaknu. He told her that just as earth is covered by water, so water is covered by Vāyu, even so in succession each one, namely, Vāyu, space, Gandharvaloka, the Sun, and Prajāpati-loka, is contained in what is stated next to it. Finally he told her that the world of Prajāpati is contained in the Brahmaloка. But when Gārgi asked him to say what is that in which the Brahmaloка is contained, Yājñavalkya warned her not to go beyond the limits of inferential knowledge, lest her head might fall, meaning thereby that the Deity about whom she was asking is to be realized and not discussed about.

The sixth Brāhmaṇa is devoted to the description of all the all-pervading entities up to the Sūtrātmā, and the seventh is concerned with the Antaryāmin of that very Sūtrātmā. Gārgi being silent, there came forward Uddālaka Āruṇi and he narrat-

ed to Yājñavalkya how, on one occasion while, he was staying in the house of Patañjali Kāpya for studying yajña śāstra, a gandharva, named, Kabandha asked Kāpya whether he knew the Sūtra and the Antaryāmin by whose power respectively all the beings are upheld and all the events in all the times are controlled. On being told that the Kāpya had no knowledge about the Sūtra or the Antaryāmin, the Gandharva imparted that knowledge to him. Uddālaka thereupon challenged Yājñavalkya to tell him what the Gandharva had told them or be prepared to lose his head by his curse. 'Vāyu is that Sūtra,' replied Yājñavalkya; 'for when the Vāyu leaves a man at the time of death, all his limbs become powerless. Though subtle, it is the support of the earth and all other beings. It is even the liṅga-deha the subtle body consisting of the five elements, ten sense-organs, prāṇa and antaḥkaraṇa.' In short, it covers both the cosmos and the acosmos. Regarding the Antaryāmin, Yājñavalkya said, it is He who lives within the earth, but whom the earth does not know, whose body and the senses are the earth itself, who controls the earth and makes it active. Being ever free, he has no desire and no karma of his own; he lives for the sake of others. He is the Ātman in you, in me and in all the beings, and is altogether different from the transmigratory jivas. Similarly, again, he who lives in water, fire, wind, the celestial worlds, the ākāśa, the darkness, the light, the entire beings, the prāṇa, speech, eyes, ears, mind, skin, the Vijnāna and semen, is the immortal Ātman in you, O Uddālaka, in me and in all the beings. He is the seer, the hearer, the thinker and the knower though himself he is neither seen, nor heard, nor thought of nor known by any one. Any thing or any one other than this Antaryāmin is perishable'. Uddālaka became silent.

Then again came forward Gārgī Vācakaṇvī, to whom will be shown in this eighth Brāhmaṇa that the upādhiless and the directly visible Brahman is ever free and uncontaminated by hunger, thirst and by all other qualities. 'What is that', asked Gārgī, in which all that is above, below and in the middle of this universe, as well as all that happened in the past, is happening in the present, and will happen in the future, is thoroughly contained.' To this Yājñavalkya replied, it is the Sūtra about which I have already spoken, and it is contained in the unmanifest Ākāśa, which remains in all the conditions of creation,

sustenance and dissolution'. Gārgi thereupon asked her second question, 'what is that in which the Ākāśa is thoroughly contained?' Yājñavalkya replied, 'It is Akṣara, meaning thereby that it is that which neither decays nor perishes. It cannot be said to be a Substance having dimensions, since it is neither gross nor subtle, nor short nor long. It is also devoid of any quality such as red, dark, etc. It is eyeless, earless, and yet it sees and hears. It is not like the light of the Sun, nor like the prāṇa in the body; it is indivisible, continual and without any holes in it. There is nothing external to it. It does not eat, nor is eaten.' That one may not conclude that it does not exist at all, Yājñavalkya said that by the controlling power of this Akṣara it is that the Sun and the moon and all the worlds and divinities are upheld in their orbits and made to shine. By its power time is measured, and the rivers flow eastward or westward; the fruits of charity, penances and sacrifices are distributed by its power, and not by the "apūrva" of the Mīmāṃsakas, or Pradhāna of the Sāṃkhya-s. Penances and performance of sacrifices for thousands of years will all perish, if one does not possess the knowledge of this Akṣara, which is the Parabrahma, the Truth of truths. One who departs from this world after having realized the Akṣara can alone be called a Brahmin.' Gārgi saluted Yājñavalkya and advised all the other Brahmins to do so.

Finally, in the ninth Brāhmaṇa there came forward Vidagdha Śākalya with a number of questions all of which were motivated by the desire to provoke and harass Yājñavalkya. For doing so, he was rightly rebuked by Yājñavalkya, but Śākalya did not understand it. He continued to put questions one after another, regarding how many gods there are, what the eight Vasus, the eleven Rudras, the twelve Ādityas are, what attributes the one God, Prāṇa possesses, how many Puruṣas there are, what particular deity Yājñavalkya himself has become in the various directions. After giving appropriate replies to all these questions, Yājñavalkya asked Śākalya in return if he knew the Aupaniṣadic Puruṣa who lives in his own glory, and added that if he were unable to explain clearly and unambiguously, his head would fall. As Śākalya had no realization of the Ātman, the Upaniṣad tells us that his head fell down on the earth.

Referring to his own truthful nature probably, Yājñavalkya then told the Brahmins that a great man has his greatness in

being truthful. He then wished to know from them the cause by which the world is produced again after it has been dissolved. As no one could give any answer to his question, the Upaniṣad tells us that it is the direct experience of the blissful Brahman (Vijñānam Ānandam Brahma).

Now, in the context of this Brahmanānda Śrī Śaṅkarācārya observes that ānanda is the core of the experience of Brahman and is non-different from it. The Pūrva-pakṣa contends that notwithstanding the impossibility of there being any action, the knower of the Ātman knows that he is blissful. This means that the Ānanda in Brahman is independently an object of experience. As against this, the Upaniṣadic siddhānta (conclusion) is that there can be no separate consciousness of ānanda during the condition of liberation on account of there being complete oblivion of the consciousness of the body and the senses. The realizer of Brahman cannot have any separate existence apart from Brahman, just as a piece of salt cannot, have if it is put in water. Therefore he will not experience the ānanda of Brahman as separated from his realization. To say that he remains separate is to go against the great statement, 'Tat Tvam asi' (thou art that) which means the jiva is the Brahman; and to say that he is both separate and not separate is meaningless.

Adhyāya : IV

The first two Brāhmaṇas of this adhyāya are devoted to the consideration of how the realization of Brahman can be achieved by some such means as looking upon the divinities of fire, etc., out of which speech, etc., have originated, as the forms of Brahman only. In the first, Janaka tells Yājñavalkya what Śailini had told him, namely, that Vāk (speech) meaning thereby the divinity of fire, is the Brahman. 'But, what would be the use of this to a dumb person?' inquired Yājñavalkya. Besides, as Śailini had not told Janaka as to what constitutes the support of Vāk, it amounted only to a portion of the knowledge of Brahman. Yājñavalkya then told the king that Vāk is the instrument of intellectual knowledge, as it makes us informed as to who our friends are, as also about the knowledge of the four Vedas, history, Purāṇas, Upaniṣads, the Brahma-Sūtras, the sacrifices and their rituals, and of various worlds and beings.

Ākāśa is its support. One who worships the Vāk as Parabrahma is favoured and protected by all beings. He becomes God-like on earth, and one with God after death. Janaka then told how Udanka, Barku, Gardhabha-vipita, Jābāla, Satyakāma, Vidagdha Śākalya, had respectively told him that Prāṇa, the eye, the ear, the Mind, and the heart were the Brahman, upon which Yājñavalkya observed that all these teachings amounted only to certain aspects of the Brahman, but that they were of no use to the person who is either dead, or blind, or deaf, or to one whose mind is vacant or who is heartless. The support of them all is Ākāśa; and that one who worships any one of them as Parabrahma is favoured and protected by all beings, and that one becomes God-like on earth, and one with God after death. The heart, however, said Yājñavalkya, is the receptacle and the support of all beings and things which have names, forms and actions, and that Prajāpati is the divinity who resides in the heart.

In the second Brāhmaṇa, Yājñavalkya first praises the king for being learned and devoted as well as wealthy and prosperous, but tells him immediately afterwards that all his glory will be of no use in the absence of the Knowledge of the Ātman, and that he would not be free from fear. So saying, Yājñavalkya told him that the Puruṣa in the right eye is known as 'satya' or 'Indha' on account of his resplendent beauty, though gods call him as Indra. The Puruṣa in the left eye is known as Īndrāṇī. So, by knowing these two Puruṣas, one would know the Ātman as Vaiśvānara and Taijas, that is the Ātman in the waking and the dreaming conditions. From this one would go to the knowledge of the Prājña Ātman that is, one who remains usually unknown on account of deep sleep. But, if one realizes this Ātman he would go beyond fear. The transformation of the Vaiśvānara into the Taijas, of Taijas into the Prājña, and of Prājña into Turiya (fourth) which transcends the three states, shows that there can be only gradual liberation or what is known as krama-mukti.

On an earlier occasion when Yājñavalkya and Janaka had discussed some problems about Agnihotra, Yājñavalkya was much pleased with Janaka on account of his excellent knowledge about karma-kāṇḍa. And so, he had given the King a boon whereby he could ask Yājñavalkya any question he liked.

Janaka now takes that opportunity and asks Yājñavalkya as to what that light may be which shines and makes a man active in various ways when the lights of the Sun, the moon, the fire, the word and its sound are not there. That is the light of the Ātman which is present during the three conditions of waking, dreaming, and sleeping, which is internal, non-sensuous, independent and which therefore goes beyond all the above-mentioned lights, the body, the senses, and the objects of the senses including even the Sun, the moon, etc.

Here come forward the Lokāyatas who say that the Ātman cannot be non-physical, though he may be different from the senses, just as the Sun and the moon etc., are physical in nature though they too are different from the senses. Besides, what is known as consciousness or Caitanya is only an attribute of the body, for, it is present when the body is present and not otherwise. The Ātman can be considered as a part of the body, just as the eye which gives light is a part of it. The light of the body need not always manifest. Like the glow-worm it may sometimes shine and sometimes not. This would be the additional argument according to Svabhāva-vādin. To this Vedāntin replies, that it is the Caitanya which is both the seer and the recaller, and it is different from the body which can never move even a little when it becomes a corpse. It must be the same consciousness which wishing to touch an object becomes first aware of it by means of the sight. Mind too cannot be called as the seer, because it also becomes an object of thought for some one. The Ātma-jyoti, though it is different from the senses and the body, does not become perceivable by the senses just as the Sun and the moon are. This shows that the Ātman is internal, while the other lights are only external. Besides, the Caitanya remains independently with or without the body. And as to why the glow-worm is seen sometimes shining and sometimes not is on account of its wings, which sometimes cover its light and sometimes not. Though the Ātman resides in the heart and is different from the Vijñāna or the buddhi, it throws its light on the body and the senses and makes them endowed with consciousness. Buddhi being nearest to the Ātman and crystal-like pure becomes immediately affected by the Caitanya of the Ātman, and so it bewilders even the wise by creating in them the wrong notion that

Buddhi (Vijñāna) itself is the Ātman. Similarly, the mind being nearest to buddhi, and in contact with it also creates the wrong notion that the mind is endowed with Caitanya. Similarly, again, there occur in succession the third and the fourth false notions that the senses which are in contact with the mind, and the body to which the senses belong are conscious by themselves. Naturally, people begin to believe falsely that the buddhi or the senses or the body is the Ātman. And when it becomes impossible for the human intellect to distinguish between the Ātman and the buddhi on account of their close proximity and apparent similarity, there occur the mutual superimpositions of the names and forms of the phenomenal world upon the Ātman, and of the Ātman, and its attributes upon buddhi, senses and the rest of the phenomenal world. There arises also the wrong belief that the Ātman remains continuously transmigrating from one body to another, and as moving from the waking to the dreaming and the sleeping states. The buddhi meditates, and it is wrongly supposed that the Ātman meditates. In fact, the Ātman, being all-pervading, self-effulgent, and bereft of any imperfection, he is the only Puruṣa who is ever beyond the province of death, namely, karma, avidyā, body, sense, mind, and buddhi.

It is at this point that the two schools of Buddhism, namely, the Sautrāntikas and the Vaibhāṣikas, come forward with the view that it is the Buddhi which throws its light both ways, on the Ātman as well as on the objects which are external. Going a step further, the Vijñānavādin says that what is known by the Buddhi, is not only the jar but the light also taken along with it and denies not only the externality of the jar but its continued existence also. What exists for a moment, in other words, is for him the Vijñāna or an idea in the buddhi. Going beyond this a step further, the Śūnyavādin denies any real existence to the Vijñāna also, inasmuch as it is covered by avidyā. For him, there is a complete void, neither the external objects, nor the momentary internal Vijñāna. All the four schools, however, agree in viewing the light of the Ātman as unnecessary for manifesting the Vijñāna.

While refuting these arguments, the Vedāntin says that, in the first place, though a jar which is kept in darkness is distinct from buddhi, it has no capacity to manifest itself; and that,

secondly, though buddhi, like a lamp, is capable of throwing its light on other objects, it requires for its own manifestation the light of the Ātman. And, thirdly, as against the Vijñānavādin, who holds the view that objects are, as in a dream, non-different from the Vijñāna or ideas in the dream, the Vedāntin points out that words would then lose their specific meanings and simply be the synonyms of each other. Then, there would be no distinction between means and ends, no possibility of any instruction, no distinction between Pūrvapakṣa and Uttarapakṣa, between merits and demerits; no search for truth, and no difference between the existence and non-existence of Vijñāna. As for the doctrine of momentariness, the Vedāntin says that it is utterly false, since the jar seen in one moment is recognized as the same in the succeeding moments of time. The explanation that this recognition occurs on account of the similarity of the several jars is also not satisfactory. For, there cannot be any similarity unless there is first the identity of the jar, that is of the continued existence of the same jar. Over and above this, what is required for recognition is the continued existence of the person who connects the memory-image of the jar in the moment that has gone before with the perception of the same jar in the second moment, and who says that it is the same jar. What appears as most astounding to the Vedāntin is that there should be none to enjoy the fruit of Nirvāṇa after the light of the Vijñāna is extinguished.

Now, so far as the waking condition is concerned the Ātman appears to be so much mixed up and contaminated with the various objects that it becomes almost impossible to show that he is distinct from everything else. In sleep, there being no possibility of seeing even the concrete objects, it is not also possible to have a distinct and clear knowledge about the Ātman. But that he is self-effulgent, the creator, and has the power as if to migrate from one condition to another, and that he can look beyond the present time to both the past and the future, is only proved by means of the dreaming consciousness. For, in the absence of the senses and of the light of the Sun, the moon, etc., the Ātma-jyoti stands apart from them all, and produces objects according to the desires of the mind which is active in a dream, though this activity also is due to

the ever wakeful condition and the light of the Ātman. What is, however, common to the three states is that the Ātman, notwithstanding the appearance that he is the doer on account of the upādhis of body, mind, senses, and the buddhi in the waking life, he is never so. Naturally, in the absence of any action on his part, how can there be the birth or the death of the Ātman? He is ever uncontaminated and immortal, though in the wakeful condition he appears to be more contaminated than in the dream, and not contaminated at all during sleep, for which, however, there is no evidence. Like a hawk who becomes tired and exhausted on account of his flights high up in the sky, and who therefore returns to his nest for taking rest, the Ātman comes to rest in sleep and becomes dissociated, for the time being, from desires and avidyā.

Now, what this avidyā which is poles apart from Vidyā means is that it is nothing but ignorance of the nature of the Ātman. It exists wherever there is the awareness of any difference, and it vanishes the moment there is the consciousness of the unity of all. When one becomes the Self of all, he comes to realize even during his dream that he is nothing but the Caitanya. On the contrary, what avidyā does is to make a man accept all things other than the Ātman as real; and so, he never gets out of the circle of desires, actions, and fruits. Even if one would contend that these are absent during sleep, it should not be assumed that avidyā is then completely rooted out; for, again, in the wakeful condition, one becomes overcome by desires. So, that man alone can be called as an Ātmajñānī who is bereft of any desire (akāma) even during his waking life, and who therefore goes beyond grief and misery. This is the condition of Mokṣa, of perfection, liberation and freedom.

Like the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas who hold that desire being only a quality, it must be located in the Ātman, Bhartṛ-prapañca also holds that since desires are said to be contained in the heart (ṛhdi sthitāḥ), and since the heart is connected with the Ātman, they must be permanently residing in the Ātman in a residual manner, just as the fragrance of flowers which are put in the oil, clings to the oil, even if the flowers are taken out of it. This means that the Ātman can never be bereft of desires, and, as such, can never be wholly uncontaminated and pure. But it

must be noted that instead of dissolving the compound Ātmakāma as 'Kāma of the Ātman', it can also be dissolved in such a way as to mean that the Ātman (i.e., the realization of the Ātman) is the only Kāma. And then it will be an easy step to understand how the Ātma-kāma becomes the Āptakāma (one whose desires are fulfilled) and how, further, he becomes Akāma (as having no desire). Similarly, again, it will be only on the view that there is no difference between quality and substance that one can understand how there can be no difference between the sight of the Seer and the Seer himself, just as there can be no difference between the Sun and the rays and the light of the Sun. The Ātman is one and not many; but just as the pure and white crystal looks differently coloured on account of the contiguous coloured objects, or like the Ākāśa which appears as split into ghaṭākāśa, maṭhākāśa, etc., on account of the walls of the jar or of the house, even so the Ātman appears as many on account of its several upādhis, and as having the specific knowledge of various objects in both the waking and dreaming conditions. But as there are no objects created by avidyā during dreamless sleep, the Ātman can never be said to have any specific knowledge of things other than Himself.

This, says Yājñavalkya, is the fearless immortal Brahmaloka or the Brahman himself. This is the highest destination of the Vijñānamaya Puruṣa where there would be no trace of avidyā, higher than the position of the gods. This is the highest and the imperishable Ānanda, by the power and support of a digit of which live all other beings. Starting with the ānanda of a sound-bodied young sovereign as the unit to measure, and multiplying it at every stage by one hundred, we get in succession before we attain the highest Ānanda of the realization of the Ātman, the ānanda of the Fathers, that of the Gandharvas, that of the gods and so on, up to the ānanda of the Hiraṇyagarbha or Prajāpati. One need not, however, suppose that because the process of multiplication is involved in measuring the bliss of the Ātman, it is only quantitatively different from other sensuous pleasures in life. The difference is so great that it can only be said that it is a difference of quality, a difference in kind and not simply of degrees. To achieve this Ānanda, mere study of the Vedas and sinlessness are not enough. What is indispensable is absolute Vairāgya meaning thereby complete desirelessness.

The purpose of this Brāhmaṇa is to describe how and when the Jivātman leaves the body and obtains a new one. At the time of death, there occurs the twofold phenomenon, namely, the departure of the governing deities to their original sources, that is to the Sun, the Wind, etc., and of the assembling of all the senses in the heart of the dying man. The heart then becomes extremely illumined by the light of the Caitanya which assumes the form of the mental condition indicating the kind of desire which the dying man wishes to fulfil in his future birth. It is therefore on account of the upādhi of the liṅga-deha, that the Ātman is said to be transmigrating, and so, being subject to birth and death. And then, corresponding to the destination, whether it is the Sun, the Brahmaloṅka, or something else, he goes out of the body through the eye, the head, etc., and like a king followed by his ministers, the departing soul is followed by the chief Prāṇa and the other senses. In order to know what he wants to obtain in a life after death, the jīva is asked to restrain the imaginings of the mind, and do, out of faith and humility, meritorious acts for the good of others. Nay, what he would wish to be after death at the time of death, should be borne in mind throughout his life before death, and must be supported by suitable actions. But neither karma alone nor the favours of the deities will be sufficient to make him free from the bondage of saṁsāra. For, after all, the deities also are a part of the perishable saṁsāra. The only effective remedy is the realization of the Brahman. Whatever else is achieved during life-time, by means of vidyā, karma, and desires (known as Pūrva-prajñā) goes along with the departing soul, as the threefold food which would be useful to him on his journey towards a new birth.

This new birth may be of an insect or of an elephant; the capacity of the senses to know and act becomes contracted or expanded on account of the power of the Chief Prāṇa. The jīva too does not leave the old body till it finds a new body which is suitable to his vāsanā (desire), vidyā, and karma. The subtle body or the liṅga-deha which departs grows into a gross one, and forthwith comes to reside in all other senses. The several other upādhis also become collected in the new life of the soul. Naturally, the Ātman also appears as if he is endowed with several qualities. Being associated and identified with buddhi, he is said to be the Vijñānamaya, the doer of actions, and the enjoyer of

their good or bad fruits. Connected with the mind, he is known as Manomaya; with prāṇa, he is known as prāṇamaya, and appears as making movements; even so he is known as Cakṣurmaya, Srotramaya, Āpomaya and Ākāśamaya. Being carried away by all sorts of desires and being bound by the chain of causes and effects, he is known as Kāmamaya, and being disgusted with them he is known as A-(not)-kāmamaya, A-krodhamaya, and so on.

All this is equally accepted both by the Pūrvapakṣa and the Siddhāntin. But what the latter wishes to emphasize is that desires become stronger and stronger as they become fulfilled; and that in order to fulfil them again and again, there occurs the transmigration of the soul, which, however, is not its real destiny. No doubt, desire (Kāma) is a fundamental cause of saṁsāra; but more fundamental than Kāma is the ignorance of what is Real. Kāma then becomes only an accessory cause. That is why when the Kāma is subdued, and ignorance is removed; the soul ceases to migrate, the prāṇas do not depart, and there occurs the realization of the Brahman. The akāmayamāna, in other words, becomes niṣkāma and niṣkriya. No kind of karma can ever contaminate him then. He becomes Āptakāma; there remains in him the only desire of being ever lodged in the Ātman. He becomes liberated even while he is living; and so he need not wait for being liberated till the fall of his body.

Liberation means the illuminational knowledge of the Ātman; it can never be compared with the transitory fruits of actions. Nor can it be said to be non-transitory in the sense in which the Naiyāyikas consider the destruction (dhvaṅsa) of a thing. For while the destruction of a jar, though eternally the same, has got only a nominal existence, corresponding to which there exists nothing, liberation has got a positive meaning, namely, the realization of the Ātma-jñāna, which is an actual, concrete existence of being experienced by some one. Just as light and heat which are the natural characteristics of fire, and which are only manifested and not created by the burning of the wood, even so what all the upādhis and the three conditions of the soul, namely, the sleeping, the dreaming and waking, might do is to become useful in manifesting the upādhiless nature of the Brahman. Strictly speaking, as there is nothing else but the Ātman or Brahman who is ever free, to say that liberation consists in the freedom from bondage of the jīva is not correct. It is freedom

from the supposed feeling of being bound which is due to the ignorance of the Ātman.

It is interesting to note that the locus of both the knowledge and of the joy of the Ātman falls in the Ātman itself, whereas the loci of them with reference to the sensuous objects fall in different places; that of the knowledge, in the contact of the sense with the object, and that of the joy in the mind of the person. The knowledge and the joy (ānanda) of the Ātman are the constituents and not the adjectives of the Ātman. Both are involved simultaneously in the perception of the Ātman which cannot be obstructed by dharma or adharma. A man, however, becomes immersed in saṁsāra on account of his own forgetfulness or ignorance of the fact that he is in reality nothing but the Ātman. The perception of the Ātman is eclipsed by ignorance, and the remedy for removing it is the cultivation of the moral virtues and resorting to spiritual discipline. Thus, when a man goes beyond all his desires, especially beyond the desires for progeny, wealth and power, his body has for him no more value than what a serpent has for the dead skin which it has cast away. For, he has then already become the Self of all. Avidyā being destroyed by Vidyā, he then considers himself as the disembodied Brahman only. To him, then, both the Arcirmārga (Devayāna) and the Dhūmamārga (Pitryāna) appear as paths of saṁsāra only; for, he knows by experience that whoever goes by the Jñānamārga is alone the doer of puṇya, that he alone becomes lustrous, and achieves the lordship over all. All this, however, can be accomplished by resorting to sannyāsa (Parivrājya) which is far more an internal than an external means of removing desires and cravings which act as motives for doing actions. Sannyāsa it is which stabilizes the Ātmajñāna, and enables a man to go beyond doubt, beyond sin, and beyond the three states of wakefulness, dream, and sleep. To achieve this is to become as fearless as the Ātman.

The fifth Brāhmaṇa deals with the nature and necessity of sannyāsa and its relation to knowledge and karma. The Pūrva-pakṣa holds that the entire import of the Vedic instruction is the injunction to do actions, such as is given in the passage. 'One should keep up the sacrificial fire throughout his life.' Hence,

passages which recommend the renunciation of Karma are meant for those who are somehow unfit to do works, such as the blind, the deaf, and the lame. As against this, the Siddhāntin says that right from the beginning of the Upaniṣadic statement (Br. 1.4.7) 'one should worship the Ātman,' up to the description of the same (Br. 4.4.22), it has been repeatedly proved that Ātmajñāna alone is the means of being immortal. This means that there will be no scope for doing any action after one has realized the knowledge of the Ātman. At this, the Pūrvapakṣin might modify his earlier statement and say that knowledge should be combined with karma for obtaining immortality. But as he does not advance any evidence as to why knowledge should be combined with karma, his position becomes at once unsound. On the contrary, he is shown that the very motive for doing actions is destroyed as soon as the difference between the worshipper and the worshipped is wiped out by Ātmajñāna. Even the awareness of the six kinds of relation, namely, kartā, karma, karaṇa (instrument), Sampradāna (the person to whom a thing is given), Apādana (the thing given), and Adhikaraṇa (the place where it is given) does not exist during the knowledge created by Vidyā. The knowledge of the Ātman is Vastu-tantra (depending on the will of the Ātman) and not puruṣa-tantra (depending on the desires of man). Till this knowledge arises, karma-kāṇḍa is not without meaning; but, then, karma only, and not the combination of it with jñāna is possible. Even so with the rise of the Ātmajñāna there will be no necessity for the performance of works, and so, there will be no combination of jñāna with karma. The only relation which can be established between karma and jñāna is that good and benevolent works help to purify the mind, and so are useful only in an indirect manner for the emergence of the Ātmajñāna.

Thus, whether we talk about the sannyāsa of one who has realized the Brahman (Vidvat-sannyāsa), or about the sannyāsa of one who wishes to realize the Brahman (Vividiṣā sannyāsa) what is common to both so far as the works are concerned is that only such works as have moral excellence are highly useful. Excepting this, disgust for all other objects (Vairāgya) is the ultimate test of sannyāsa. Then, naturally one is free to accept sannyāsa even while one is a celibate. Therefore, it should now be clear that even such karmas as the Viśvajit and the

Aśvamedha sacrifices as also the bodies of the performers of them, have their end in a heap of ashes, whether the man lives for a hundred years or not. What one should therefore do is to go by the way of śravaṇa and manana in order to realize the Ātman. Let the counsel of doing works for one hundred years be reserved for the ignorant.

Adhyāya : V

What follows in this fifth and the next adhyāya is the 'Khila-kāṇḍa' wherein will be described various upāsanaś which not being incompatible with karma are capable of bestowing both prosperity and gradual release. First, however, comes for consideration the interpretation of the mantra, 'Pūrṇam idaṁ pūrṇam adaḥ', etc., which Bhartṛprapañca and his followers have done. They hold that throughout the three conditions of origination, existence, and dissolution, 'that is throughout the past, the present and the future times', the effect and its cause are perfect and equally real.

Untenable is this position, says Śrī Śaṅkarācārya. For, where the subject-matter is some action, a general rule and an exception are both possible. For instance, there is the general rule that no animal should be killed; but an exception to this is also allowed namely, in the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice. But Brahman being non-dual, there cannot be, in the first place, a part of it where the exception can be allowed. Second, it is wrong to say that the non-dual Brahman comes into being and is dissolved. Drinking of Soma juice through a pot known as Ṣodaśī is optional in the Atirātra sacrifice. But it does not depend on the wish of a person whether Brahman should be dual or one; similarly, in the third place, one cannot combine jñāna and works as he likes. Fourth, the recognition of the experience of the Brahman will be the same even after a very long time. Besides, to suppose that the Ātman is transitory would jeopardize the position of the karma-kāṇḍa itself; for, there being no permanent doer of actions, one might get the fruits of actions which are not done by him, or not get the fruits of those which he might have done. But once a person is established in the realization of the Ātman, he ceases to be interested in actions and

passages which recommend the renunciation of Karma are meant for those who are somehow unfit to do works, such as the blind, the deaf, and the lame. As against this, the Siddhāntin says that right from the beginning of the Upaniṣadic statement (Br. 1.4.7) 'one should worship the Ātman,' up to the description of the same (Br. 4.4.22), it has been repeatedly proved that Ātmajñāna alone is the means of being immortal. This means that there will be no scope for doing any action after one has realized the knowledge of the Ātman. At this, the Pūrvapakṣin might modify his earlier statement and say that knowledge should be combined with karma for obtaining immortality. But as he does not advance any evidence as to why knowledge should be combined with karma, his position becomes at once unsound. On the contrary, he is shown that the very motive for doing actions is destroyed as soon as the difference between the worshipper and the worshipped is wiped out by Ātmajñāna. Even the awareness of the six kinds of relation, namely, kartā, karma, karaṇa (instrument), Sampradāna (the person to whom a thing is given), Apādāna (the thing given), and Adhikaraṇa (the place where it is given) does not exist during the knowledge created by Vidyā. The knowledge of the Ātman is Vastu-tantra (depending on the will of the Ātman) and not puruṣa-tantra (depending on the desires of man). Till this knowledge arises, karma-kāṇḍa is not without meaning; but, then, karma only, and not the combination of it with jñāna is possible. Even so with the rise of the Ātmajñāna there will be no necessity for the performance of works, and so, there will be no combination of jñāna with karma. The only relation which can be established between karma and jñāna is that good and benevolent works help to purify the mind, and so are useful only in an indirect manner for the emergence of the Ātmajñāna.

Thus, whether we talk about the sannyāsa of one who has realized the Brahman (Vidvat-sannyāsa), or about the sannyāsa of one who wishes to realize the Brahman (Vividiṣā sannyāsa) what is common to both so far as the works are concerned is that only such works as have moral excellence are highly useful. Excepting this, disgust for all other objects (Vairāgya) is the ultimate test of sannyāsa. Then, naturally one is free to accept sannyāsa even while one is a celibate. Therefore, it should now be clear that even such karmas as the Viśvajit and the

Aśvamedha sacrifices as also the bodies of the performers of them, have their end in a heap of ashes, whether the man lives for a hundred years or not. What one should therefore do is to go by the way of śravaṇa and manana in order to realize the Ātman. Let the counsel of doing works for one hundred years be reserved for the ignorant.

Adhyāya : V

What follows in this fifth and the next adhyāya is the 'Khila-kāṇḍa' wherein will be described various upāsanaś which not being incompatible with karma are capable of bestowing both prosperity and gradual release. First, however, comes for consideration the interpretation of the mantra, 'Pūrṇam idaṁ pūrṇam adaḥ', etc., which Bhartṛprapañca and his followers have done. They hold that throughout the three conditions of origination, existence, and dissolution, 'that is throughout the past, the present and the future times', the effect and its cause are perfect and equally real.

Untenable is this position, says Śrī Śaṅkarācārya. For, where the subject-matter is some action, a general rule and an exception are both possible. For instance, there is the general rule that no animal should be killed; but an exception to this is also allowed namely, in the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice. But Brahman being non-dual, there cannot be, in the first place, a part of it where the exception can be allowed. Second, it is wrong to say that the non-dual Brahman comes into being and is dissolved. Drinking of Soma juice through a pot known as Śodaśī is optional in the Atirātra sacrifice. But it does not depend on the wish of a person whether Brahman should be dual or one; similarly, in the third place, one cannot combine jñāna and works as he likes. Fourth, the recognition of the experience of the Brahman will be the same even after a very long time. Besides, to suppose that the Ātman is transitory would jeopardize the position of the karma-kāṇḍa itself; for, there being no permanent doer of actions, one might get the fruits of actions which are not done by him, or not get the fruits of those which he might have done. But once a person is established in the realization of the Ātman, he ceases to be interested in actions and

their fruits. His whole interest lies in seeing that the trustworthiness of scriptural knowledge and that of his spiritual teacher's experience are verified by his own experience.

Now regarding other upāsanās. The three-word mantra 'Om, Kham Brahma' tells us that Om is both the symbol and the name of Brahman, and that, if meditated upon, it enables one to attain either the sopādhika Brahman (kham Brahma) or the nirupādhika Brahman or both of them, as one would like to attain, and that one who knows the significance of Om can be said to have known the significance of all the Vedas.

Then, in an allegory we are told how the Prajāpati gave the same instruction, namely, 'da' to gods, men, and the demons, but that it meant 'self-control' (damana) with reference to gods who have no self-control, 'charity' (dāna) with reference to men who are by nature greedy, and 'compassion' (dayā) with reference to demons who are cruel and full of anger. But, the purpose of the allegory is chiefly meant for men, who, as is commonly seen, have no control over their senses, are greedy, cruel and become angry. The Prajāpati referred here is the Intelligence (Buddhi) located in the heart, and is known by various names, such as, Satya Brahman, Sūtrātmā, Hiranyagarbha, and the Virāṭ Puruṣa. He resides in the Sun as well as in the right eye, as the Ādhidaivika and the Ādhyātmika forms of himself inasmuch as these two aspects of him take the support of each other for their own respective functions of enabling the eye to see and of seeing the Sun. This same Puruṣa is also known as Manomaya, since he resides in the innermost portion of the heart and is known by the mind, and seen by the Yogins. It is he who controls and protects all beings and bestows the same power on his worshipper.

One who worships the Brahman as endowed with the quality of lightning (vidyut), namely, that of destroying the darkness of the clouds by breaking them through, becomes able to destroy all his sins which come in his way of realizing the Ātman. Another upāsanā consists of thinking about Prāṇa and Vāk as the instruments of Vāk of nourishing the thinking mind. We are then told that the Puruṣa (soul) who departs from the body first becomes one with the wind (Vāyu); then it ascends to the Āditya, then to the moon, and finally reaches the region of Prajāpati, when it becomes bereft of bodily and mental afflictions.

But even while living, if one were to contemplate in advance upon the condition of one's dead body, namely, that it would be burnt, burns all one's sins and attains the highest loka. Another upāsana takes the form of worshipping the Brahman as consisting of food and prāṇa; which would give support to his body as also strength to enjoy the life. It is this prāṇa which is also recommended to be worshipped as 'Yajus' as 'Sāma', and as 'Kṣatra'.

Gāyatrī is one more form of worship of the Brahman, by resorting to which one can protect his prāṇa and wealth besides helping one in realizing the Brahman, and in getting the knowledge of the three Vedas, and the Lordship over all. The mantra of this Gāyatrī (Sāvitrī) is : 'Tat savituḥ vareṇyaṁ/ bhargo devasya dhīmahi/dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt'. The mantra of Anuṣṭubha Sāvitrī, the divinity of which also is the Sun, consists of thirty two syllables and four quarters. It is important to note that the fourth pada (i.e. the Brahman) which is invisible according to the Gāyatrī Sāvitrī must be known and made visible. Till then the upāsana of Gāyatrī will not be complete.

The mantras in the 15th Brāhmaṇa are the same as in Īśā-vāsyopaniṣad. They constitute the prayers to the Sun-god (Āditya) of a dying man who believes in combining karma with knowledge. As the fourth pada of the Sāvitrī in the Gāyatrī metre is Āditya, and as the Satya Brahma is covered by the golden lid in the form of the lustrous disc of the Sun, it is fervently prayed that the Sun should withdraw his dazzling rays or make them 'd enoug for the physical eyes to gaze at him, and at the Satya Brahman. As the dying man knows that his senses and prāṇa are the obstacles which prevent him from being immortal, he prays to Fire that after his death, his prāṇa should be one with the wind, the body be reduced to earth in the form of ashes, and that the Fire himself as the Vaiśvānara in the stomach should remember all that the dying man might have done during his life-time, make him free from all sins, and lead him on the right and glorious path. But being conscious that he might not be able to do anything at the time of death, he simply makes salutations over salutations.

Adhyāya : VI

This Brāhmaṇa explains as to why the Prāṇa is considered as the Chief and the best among other prāṇas (senses). It is the oldest, no doubt, since it nourishes the foetus even from the time of conception. But it is also most important because it nourishes and strengthens all other senses. This is made clear by means of an allegory which tells us that once in order to decide who among the prāṇas is superior to others, Vāk, eyes, ears, mind, and semen left the body, turn by turn, and lived outside for one year. On return of each one of them, it found that all other senses were functioning properly, though on account of the departure of the senses, the person was felt to be either dumb, blind, deaf, mad, or impotent. The senses came to know that they were not so important as the Chief Prāṇa, and so quietly entered into the body. But, no sooner the Chief Prāṇa began to depart from the body than the other prāṇas began to wither and drop down. So, being frightened, they all acknowledged the superiority of the Chief Prāṇa to them all, and said that they all lived because of his support and strength, and that all the food of all creatures belonged to him.

A question is asked if Prāṇa can eat any kind of food of any creature, should a upāsaka of Prāṇa also do it likewise? The reply ought to be that he cannot do so, for, unlike Prāṇa, he has a body and senses. Poison might be the food of worms born in poison, but if it is eaten by other living beings, it will bring death unto them. To eat whatever one likes would be a sin, especially for one who has studied the Vedas.

This Brāhmaṇa is given to the description of the two paths which lead to Pitṛloka and Devaloka and of the upāsana known as the Pañcāgni-darśana which was unknown to the Brahmins till the King Pravāhaṇa Jaivali narrated it to Śvetaketu. The five fires are the heaven (Dyu-loka), the rains (Parjanya), the fire (Agni), Puruṣa (man), and woman. This is an independent upāsana, unconnected with the Agnihotra, and can be carried on only by a householder, who then goes after death by the Arcirmārga (the way of the light). Others who are not householders and yet go by this way are those who dwell in forest and do the upāsana of Satya Brahma, that is of the Hiraṇyagarbha. Others still are the sannyāsins who have renounced the world, have

control over the mind, speech, and deed. But for those who are householders, but do not practise the upāsana of the Satya Brahman, the only destiny which would be available is to be born over and over again, by doing sacrificial actions. They rise up to Pitṛloka, but come back again in the mortal world. What the practice of the Pañcāgni Vidyā would, however, do for man is to lead him gradually to the Brahmaloṇa from where there is no return to this saṁsāra again.

Index

- Action:** different from Brahmajñāna 7; not sufficient for realization of God 8; combined with Brahmajñāna 9, 10; meditation, highest type of activity 92; a sign of ignorance 136.
- Adhyātma (Upāsana):** meaning of 51.
- Allegories and Parables of** (i) Indra, Agni and Vāyu 49-50; (ii) Naciketa and Yama 59-63; (iii) Devas and Asuras 147; (iv) Yājñavalkya and Śakalya 276; (v) Janaka and Yājñavalkya; (vi) the deserted prince 217; (vii) Ajātsatru and Gārgya; (viii) Dadhyānga and Aśvinikumārs 239-240; (ix) Yājñavalkya and Bhujyu lāhyani 256-57; (x) Instruction by Prajāpati to gods, men and demons, 239-40.
- Āmsa:** jīva non-difference of Brahman 216.
- Ānandgiri:** On the meaning of Veda 353.
- Asambhuti:** 19.
- Āsvattha,** tree of existence 74-75.
- Āsvamedha:** motive of describing 137-38; fruits of 147; not sufficient for Ātmajñāna 188.
- Ātmajñāna:** essential characteristics of 15-16; requirements for 33, 55; as end of human life 42; as removal in fear of death 42-43; morality not sufficient 66, 188; effects of 68-69; means for obtaining the Ātmajñāna 161; as different from the knowledge of perceptible world 163; its of superimposition for 167; as arresting activities, objections against 169, 170; no bifurcation between subject and object 319; requirements for 231-32.
- Ātmajyoti:** internal and independent of body 289; as present in three states of consciousness 307, 380.
- Ātman:** characteristics of 2, 125-26, 262; as covered by a golden lid 2, 22; different interpretations 11, 14; as beyond the senses, mind and intellect 35-36; at the back of the sensuous experience 70; relationship between body and the Ātman 66, 72; known as Haṁsa, Vasu, Bṛhat, 72; twofold identity with Brahman 73, 77; not effected by appearances 74; subtlest of all 76; of the size of a thumb 77; manifests in pure hearts 94; pains, pleasures etc., not the qualities of Ātman 164-66; worship of Ātman results in acquiring the qualities of Ātman 174; as dearest of all 175-231; as the only Seer 306; as Āptakāma 317; as Ātmakāma 382; as the locus of joy 319; as the light of lights 287; as identical with Brahman 179; why cannot be seen directly and easily 199; Sopādhika and nirupādhika 207-8; as different from dreaming and wakeful consciousness 210; everything dear for the sake of Ātman 231; to know Ātman is to know everything else 232; can never become the object of sight or any other sense 258; as different from body

- and transmigratory soul 261;
Antaryāmin 374.
- Ātmayāji: better than devayāji 255.
- Avidyā: as binding 19; satisfying desires only 19; makes works possible 32, 189; domain of 89; as causing fear 161; subject-matter of 228.
- Bhagvadgītā: on the utility of sacrifice etc. 34; spiritual teacher 200.
- Brahmānanda: different from sensuous pleasures 309-10, 382; not separate from realization 277; comes gradually 181; Brahman as the real doer 217; common experience of teacher and disciple 338.
- Brahma-jñāna: regarding obstacles 63, 96, 183, 300; ingredient of 125; epistemological test, metaphysical truth 125; destroying Sañcita karma avidyā, karmas, desires and phenomenal appearance 184, 185, 230, 252; prāṇas of a Brahma-jñānin 250.
- Brahmaloka 76, 382.
- Brahman: described in contradictory terms 11-14, 238; covered by golden lid 21; beyond the triad of the knower, known and knowledge 36-37, 41; incapable of being worshipped 40, 53; as seen before any other thing is seen 70; as the vision of one's own immaculate form 75, 181; characteristic of 86, 90, 92, 229, 269; metaphorical description of 90; effects of 92, 96; method of realizing 91; wrong notions about 113-14, 178, 227; appearing as active 117; source and destination of all 236; as the Self of all 176, 233, 238; as the eternal Seer 181; as different from jiva 180-81; two aspects of 224-25; negative and positive descriptions of 228; as the Death of death 249; categories of substance and quality, not applicable 270, 271; size of barley, 343.
- Brāhmaṇa: realizer of Brahman 271.
- Brahmānubhava: removes moha and śoka 17.
- Brahmavidyā 52, 239; precaution before imparting 95, 286.
- Buddhi: nearest to the Ātman 291; as throwing light on the Ātman and objects 293-95.
- Buddhistic view: of karma examined 45-46; momentariness, examined 140-41, 380; on the light of the Ātman 293-95; on the existence of the Ātman 259.
- Caitanya: remains with or without body 290.
- Castes: creation of 186-87.
- Causation 355.
- Consciousness: Brahmanic, four stages of 283-84.
- Creation: no new thing 87, 117-18, 145, 341-42; no abiding value 126.
- Death: of body only 248, 250.
- Desires: knots of 77; have relevance in saṁsāra only 190, 230.
- Dissolution: process of 233, consciously brought about 234.
- Divinities: as pierced by demons 252-53; as located in the self 273-74; as collecting in heart, at death 312.
- Dream: as pointing the Ātman 297, 300, 302; objects in the dream on account of self-illuminating light of the Ātman 300; miseries 302.
- Effect: existing in cause 141-42.
- Entrance: of Brahman, metaphorical; objection 164, 167-68.
- Existence: comes out of Brahman 75; wrong views 115-16; as manifestation 142; tree of 74, 75, 163.
- Faith: means of obtaining Brahma-

- vidā 201.
- Food: seven kinds 101, 193; to eat sin 182, 193; constituting the perishable world 195.
- God: witness and Self of all 47; revealing himself 76.
- God-realization: as treading upon a razor 68; effects of 77.
- Grace: a free gift 95, necessity 98.
- Graha: and the Atigraha, meaning of 245, 247.
- Hiraṇyagarbha: limit of saṃsāra 17, 20; different from jīva and Brahman 163, 251.
- Ignorance: causing superimposition 37-38.
- Immortality: merging in Prakṛti 20; as union with the Puruṣa 21; relative and absolute meaning of 70.
- Initiation 37, 86.
- Intuition 76.
- Janaka: and Yājñavalkya 188, 282.
- Jiva: non-different from Ātman 34, 178, 213, 214; limited by upādhis 36; as moving from birth to death 310-11.
- Jivan-mukta: 124, 183.
- Jñāna: devotion and Vairāgya 125; not subservient to action 150-51, 358.
- Karma: cannot lead to liberation 254, combined with upāsana and fruits thereof 20, 45; limitation of 103; not binding 136; different schools 47; as aids for purifying 45; as combined with knowledge, nāma and rūpa 199; Nitya and naimittika 255.
- Karma-kāṇḍa 159; and Ātmajñāna 177, 286; pure mind 353.
- Liberation: see mokṣa.
- Loka: Sva-loka the same as Ātman 188; of saṃsāra, 350-51.
- Lokāyatikas 136, 378.
- Madhuvidyā: constituents of 236; Ātman as the madhu 237; contents of 240-41.
- Maitreyi 231.
- Manusmṛti: on nature of Prajāpati 162; on kāina as driving force of action 189; on nature of Ātmajñāna 255.
- Materialists 287.
- Māyāvāda: value of 12-13.
- Meditation: on Name of God 64, 339; as sacrifice 70-71; method of 91; highest type of activity 94; Contemplation on misery and death 344.
- Mīmāṃsakas: not interested in Ātman 32-33, 136; on supremacy of karma 45-46 on 'Apūrva' 375.
- Mokṣa 35, 49; gradual and immediate 96, 113; requirements 123; jivanmukta and videhamukta 124; realization of the Ātman 253, 380; removal of avidyā 303; Brahman as nitya-mukta 180; karma with upāsana 256.
- Morality: necessary, but not sufficient 54, 66; combined with devotion 93-94, 124.
- Namaskāra: as form of worship 24.
- Name (of God): as symbol 64, 113, 150, 339.
- Nihilist: viewing Ātman as physical 287.
- Nirupādhika: and Ātmajñāna 170.
- Non-existence: four varieties 143-44.
- Om: symbol of Brahman, saguṇa and nirguṇa 64, 113, 339; meditation on A, U, M, as one unit 113-14.
- Patha: southern and northern 103-4.
- Prajāpati: creator of universe 145, 341, 358; as sacrificial horse 146,

- 162-63.
- Prāṇa (Rāyī) 103; as Prajāpati 104; as support of senses 105; varieties of Prāṇa 107-8; worship of Chief prāṇa 149; the chief Prāṇa incapable of being pierced by sin 153; characteristics of 154; twofold fruits 154; effects of identification with 155-56, 197; as merging in Brahman 250, 320; and Udgītha 158; as free from death 196; Adhyātmika description of 193; compared to a child 224.
- Prārabdha: force of 173; cancelled by vidyā 184; Pūrva-prajñā 314; as creating subtle body 315.
- Pratibodha 42.
- Prayer 22-23.
- Puruṣa: Vijnānamaya as pure Self-consciousness 208; as narrated by Yājñavalkya 274; Aupaniṣadic 275; in the eye and the Sun, 342
- Ranade, R.D.: interpretation of Pūrṇaya Purnamādāya 1, 4, 25; on vidyā and avidyā 1, 4, 16, 25; characteristics of Ātman 125-26.
- Rāyī: 102.
- Sacrifice (Yajña): of a mystic 58, 71; a hazardous task 87; Āśvamedha 137-38; not sufficient for Ātmajñāna 185; fruits of different Yajñās 188-89.
- Saints (Spiritual Teacher): carries torch of truth 38; service of, resulting in prosperity and liberation 95; and Brahma vidyā 96; faith in spiritual teacher necessary for Ātmajñāna 174; service of Saint necessary for 242.
- Samsāra: constituted by actions names and forms 168, 228-29.
- Śaṅkarācārya: Interpretation of Purnasya Purnamādāya 1, on the utility of distinctions 6, 7; on saṅga Brahman 11-12; māyāvāda 12-13; vidyā and avidyā 16; existence of God; pluralistic view refuted 47; on nature of Brahman 175, 337; on Brahmānanda 276, 376; on karma-kāṇḍa and the jñāna-kāṇḍa 353-54.
- Sannyāsa: and Brahma vidyā 231, 263, 264, 372-73.
- Satpatha Brāhmaṇa: on Ātmayajī 255.
- Scripture: function of 221, 222.
- Sopādhika-Ātma: see jīva.
- Spiritual (experience) 40; varieties of 70-76; of the size of thumb 77; as dazzling gold 92; smallest and largest 94.
- Spiritual life: a process, not an event 8, 14; requirements of 56, 231.
- Sravaṇa: 231.
- Superimposition: cause of 37; psycho-metaphysical 38; as cause of pain and pleasure 167; mutual superimposition of the world and the Ātman 292.
- Suṣumnā-nāḍī 77.
- Svabhāva-vāda: naturalistic explanation of karma 182.
- Symbolism: (Tree and two birds) 93.
- Transmigration 314-15; pāpa and puṇya as responsible for 317.
- Turiya: 284.
- Udgītha 157.
- Unātman: constituting nāma, rūpa and karma 198.
- Upādhis: causing distinctions 308.
- Upaniṣadic teaching: validity of 219.
- Upāsānā: 19; requirements of 51-52; as limit of samsāra 137; of prāṇa as destroying the sins 168; on no use without the Ātmajñāna 283; and Jñāna 359.
- Vairāgya, and devotion 125; pre-requisites of realization 160.

57982

Digitized by eGangotri
Dr. V.H. Date (1900-1987) was Professor
and Head of the Department of
Philosophy, Rajasthan University and
Founder-Director of Adhyatma Sahitya
Vikas Sanstha, Jodhpur. He has
published several books and articles.

ISBN 81-215-0873-8

Books of related interest

200
O-69

Brahma Yoga of the Gita

Vedanta Explained, 2 vols.

Samkara's commentary on the Brahma Sutras, with new light on the philosophy of Samkara

Yoga of the Saints

Analysis of spiritual life

V.H. Date

The Early Upanisads

Annotated text and Translation

Patrick Olivelle

The Philosophy of Upanishads

Paul Deussen

Vicharsagar

The Metaphysics of Upanisads

Lala Shreeram

Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi